

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^o XC. JANUARY 1898.

ART. I.—THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. *Aspects of the Old Testament.* Considered in Eight Lectures, delivered before the University of Oxford. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1897. By ROBERT LAWRENCE OTTLEY, M.A., sometime Principal of the Pusey House. (London, New York, and Bombay, 1897.)
2. *Sanctuary and Sacrifice.* A Reply to Wellhausen. By the Rev. W. L. BAXTER, M.A., D.D. (London, 1895.)
3. *The Early Religion of Israel.* As set forth by Biblical Writers and by Modern Critical Historians. The Baird Lecture for 1889. By JAMES ROBERTSON, D.D. Fifth edition. (Edinburgh and London, 1896.)

MR. OTTLEY has discharged three functions of deep responsibility. He has been the vice-principal of a theological college where he had to take his part in preparing men for Holy Orders, he has presided over the House in Oxford which was endowed, and intended, to be the memorial of Dr. Pusey, and he has preached the Eight Divinity Lecture Sermons, appointed by the Bampton Trust, which are now before us. The view of the Old Testament which he has here proposed 'rather to illustrate than to defend exhaustively' has 'long been habitual' to him, and we may therefore suppose that it formed, what indeed much of the material bears traces of having formed, part of the instruction communicated to the young candidates for the sacred ministry, as they studied 'those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.'¹ We may also fairly suppose that this view of the Old Testament

¹ Art. VI. 'Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.

was displayed when teaching upon the Old Testament was imparted within the walls of the Pusey House and in the midst of the books of Dr. Pusey, to whom 'the Bible was in fact, what to all of us it is in name, but to some of us only in name, the first of books. Intimately as he was acquainted with the great writers of Christian antiquity . . . he never lost sight of the vast interval which parts the sacred canon of Scripture from all other writings in the world.'¹ And then for the third point it is not a supposition, but the fact before us, that this view of the Old Testament was deliberately adopted as fulfilling the conditions of the Bampton Trust; that is to say, as confirming or establishing the Christian faith, or as confuting all heretics and schismatics, or as bearing upon the Divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, or the authority of the writings of the primitive Fathers as to the faith and practice of the primitive Church, or the Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, or the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, or the Articles of the Christian Faith as comprehended in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds.² All, or nearly all, of these great subjects may be involved in a course of theological lectures upon the Old Testament, and whatever we may think of Mr. Ottley's mode of treating it, we may frankly admit that the subject which he chose was very proper in relation to the intentions of the founder. Indeed, in the present state of the Old Testament controversy it would be difficult to name a subject on which clear teaching was more to be desired. It is a time when anyone who has to prepare candidates for ordination, or who is endeavouring to impart to others the teaching upon Holy Scripture which he has received from Dr. Pusey, or whose duty it is to contemplate the purpose for which the Bampton Lecture was endowed, may well ponder Mr. Ottley's own remark that 'the duty of a teacher is to weigh the perils of frank utterance against those of continued silence' (Pref. p. ix). If we read aright much of the language about the Old Testament now accepted by many of those who claim to have entered upon the inheritance of the Tractarian movement, it strikes at the root of more than one of the fundamental doctrines which are mentioned in Canon Bampton's will. Bampton Lectures, therefore, on the Old Testament may be said to have been urgently required by the necessities of the times, and if Mr. Ottley's view of the subject had been the traditional view which was in vogue in the Church, we will not say in the age when the Thirty-nine

¹ Liddon's *Clerical Life and Work*, p. 361.

² See extract from Canon Bampton's will, quoted on p. vi.

Articles were produced, but in every age, which was held throughout the whole course of his life by Dr. Pusey, and which was the only view known to orthodoxy in the days of Bampton, it would not have been necessary to explain his position. But as Mr. Ottley's 'aim is to show that it is possible to regard as conclusive and to welcome with cordiality many verdicts of the "Higher Criticism"' (Pref. p. ix), a good deal of explanation is necessary.¹ Mr. Ottley himself is aware that he is in a very awkward position, and recognizes 'with sincere pain that certain assumptions and statements contained in this book may possibly cause disquiet and alarm to some devout Christians' (*ib.*). That is a possibility which does not seem to have occurred to Canon Bampton when he was making his testamentary dispositions. But many 'surprises,' as Charles Marriott would have called them, have come upon us since then, and Canon Bampton might well have doubted whether he could believe his own ears if he had been told that the body of men in which he rested the election of his lecturer might consist, with one or two exceptions, of laymen who were committed to no particular form of religious belief. As soon as we read, then, that Mr. Ottley supposes that, if the traditional view of the Old Testament 'has been shown to be inadequate or untenable,' a Christian believer 'need not cast away his faith,' we at once ask with grave concern, not merely how, then, can Mr. Ottley consent to occupy, or be elected to occupy, the position of Bampton Lecturer, but also how much of the traditional view has he given up, what does he put in its place, what does he mean by 'assured results' of modern criticism—'which sober critics of every school practically agree to accept, and which in any case have considerably modified the traditional theory of Hebrew history and religion'? We ask this question calmly and without much surprise, for the reader of Church history is familiar with the spectacle of defenders of Christianity who have

'thought to defend it best by the method of incessantly making concessions to its enemies; like those unarmed travellers who, when pursued by hungry wolves, threw first one and then another of their company to the savage brutes, in the hope that, if not sated, they would be appeased, or at least occupied, by what had been so easily surrendered. Such theological methods are dangerous in practice as well as wrong in principle; and what is given up in one generation as no part of the so-called "simple Gospel" of the Apostles, is dis-

¹ To this kind of objection Mr. Ottley would say 'We can but reply that wisdom is justified of all her children' (p. 43).

covered by the more penetrating criticism of the next to be so intimately linked with it, that the surrender becomes a good logical reason for demanding a concession of what is still unconceded.¹

The surrender of the traditional view of the Old Testament, and the tendency to ask 'What does the Old Testament matter if we have the New Testament and the Christian Church left?' have already forced some further grave questions upon us, in particular as to the use which our Lord made of the Old Testament. And that brings us, before we are perhaps aware of it, to the very citadel of Revelation. In other words, we see that a serious connexion is possible between Mr. Ottley's attitude towards the Old Testament and his relation towards certain questions connected with the Incarnation upon which we were recently constrained to warn our readers.² The readiness to accept modern theories of Kenoticism, if we may employ a barbarous word, in certain quarters, seems to proceed not so much from the supposed satisfactory nature of the theories themselves, as from the fact that they afford an easy mode of getting rid of certain sayings of our Lord about Noah and Moses and David and Jonah. If this be so, those who adopt such modern theories must beware lest in trying to save something they lose all.

When we speak of Mr. Ottley's 'view' we do not mean to imply that he has broached any original notions of his own about the Old Testament. Indeed the contrary is the case to a remarkable extent. Nor is his book an epitome of the whole controversy on the Old Testament. It is the record of what he is prepared to accept as 'assured results.' It is, as it were, a personal narrative of the state of his own mind fraught with an autobiographical interest, but lessened in permanent value when we remember that in *Higher Criticism* the assured results of to-day may be the exploded theories of to-morrow. If some are bold enough to say that no one knows what Dr. Pusey's attitude would be if he were called upon to enter the arena of present Old Testament controversies—a profession of ignorance which is published with more confidence than the matter warrants—we may be pardoned for suggesting that what are now called 'assured results' may very shortly assume a very different aspect. Let us take for an example what Mr. Baxter calls 'the warm encomia' lavished upon Wellhausen's *Prolegomena* to the

¹ Liddon, *ubi supra*, pp. 365-6.

² *Church Quarterly Review*, October 1896, No. 85, p. 41; and see *ibid.* July 1894, No. 76, pp. 378-9, for a similar connexion and a similar warning in our remarks upon Professor Sanday's Bampton Lectures.

History of Israel (Pref. p. ix). When the first part of Mr. Baxter's reply appeared Professor Sayce confessed that the result surprised him, and Mr. Gladstone said that Wellhausen was not to be envied in the task of attempting a reply.¹ Indeed Professor Sayce observes that all this confident speaking, this naïve building upon assertions as if there was no possibility of questioning them, was proved to be founded merely on German subjectivity. So, then, we do not attach even the value of finality to Mr. Ottley's selection of assured results. At present he quotes Mr. Baxter's and Professor Robertson's books as typical works of 'those whose dislike or suspicion of the critical movement has led them,' as he thinks, 'to minimize the significance and value of its assured results' (Pref. pp. viii-ix). We have previously expressed our own opinion upon these two works,² and we need not now dwell upon them, except to say that we differ from Mr. Ottley as to their value, and see with satisfaction that Professor Robertson's book has reached its fifth edition.

Mr. Ottley's first lecture on *The Christian Church and the Higher Criticism* explains the standpoint from which he approaches his subject. The second lecture surveys in general terms the five different aspects of the Old Testament which he proposes to consider. The next five lectures deal with these aspects in detail, and the concluding lecture on *The Old Testament and Christianity* inquires into the present use of the Old Testament in the Christian Church, and sums up Mr. Ottley's conclusions. We may say at once that we cannot comment on many details to which we should be obliged to take serious objection; and we may be excused if in our endeavour to set the grave nature of Mr. Ottley's position before our readers, we omit to enlarge upon many qualities which Mr. Ottley's brilliant gifts as a scholar, a divine, and a preacher cannot help infusing into the productions of his mind. Those gifts have exercised such an influence for good on so many young men at Cuddesdon and at Oxford that it is the more necessary that we should speak very plainly about the tendencies which we deplore in these lectures.

After a short exordium on the word 'Catholic' (which reminds us that a very scholarly leaflet on the use of that term has just been issued by the Church Committee for Church Defence and Church Instruction³), and a word of

¹ Baxter, p. v.

² *Church Quarterly Review* for October 1892 and October 1896.

³ S.P.C.K. Tract No. 2497. By W. Bright, D.D.

explanation that the lectures will not attempt to reconstruct the history of Israel, but will approach the subject from the point of view of Old Testament theology, Mr. Ottley makes three important preliminary statements upon the doctrine of the Incarnation, Inspiration, and the supposed results of historical criticism. 'We approach the Old Testament,' says Mr. Ottley, 'as believers in the Incarnation of the Son of God' (p. 12), and he takes occasion under this head to consider some teachings suggested by the analogy that subsists between the written and the Incarnate Word of God (*cf.* also p. 373). That is a subject which requires exceedingly careful handling, and after duly weighing all Mr. Ottley's precautions and explanations, we are left with one or two phrases on which we would gladly have further reassurance. We will mention them and then pass on:— (1) 'In the Bible the Word of God comes to us,' and it is added in the footnote, 'We must not without caution identify the "Word of God" with "Scripture." Such an identification is not Biblical and is open to serious objection' (p. 15; *cf.* p. 400).¹ (2) 'The point of primary importance to the earliest believers was not whence our Lord came, but what He *was*, what He *did*, what He claimed of men when He actually appeared' (p. 17).² (3) 'We have in fact to deal with a library in the Old Testament—a library containing . . . *semi-historical folk-lore, and primitive myths*' (p. 19).³ (4) 'On the one hand, like our Lord's human body, the Bible is a thing *in rerum natura*—a book among books; on the other, its self-witness challenges us to acknowledge a higher claim' (p. 20).⁴

Upon inspiration, in the course of a 'provisional answer' which he endeavours to make 'as brief and clear as the conditions of the subject will allow' (p. 22), Mr. Ottley observes that the term 'includes on the one hand the providential

¹ The sentence in Art. XIX. 'in which the pure Word of God is preached' will here naturally occur to the reader.

² But see St. Luke i. 35; St. John vi. 51, ix. 30, xvi. 28, and indeed the prologue of St. John's Gospel.

³ Italics ours.

⁴ Here, first, we should have liked to see a reference to 'the likeness of sinful flesh' (Rom. viii. 3); and secondly, we should have to say much more than Mr. Ottley says in the paragraph from which this extract is taken to guard against treating the Bible as one book among many. We may refer once more to the Bishop of Oxford's *Second Visitation Charge* (p. 10), and express the hope that, as he placed Mr. Ottley at Cuddesdon, his characteristic caution will not hinder him from speaking boldly yet again upon the Old Testament controversy. That it is necessary, see Ottley (p. 39).

superintendence or guidance which controlled the formation of the canon, on the other that supernatural influence which heightened the faculties, or directed the genius, of the Biblical writers' (p. 29). But he also says that 'revelation in no case undertakes the task of imparting information in regard to the events of past history,' and he expressly maintains 'that the very idea of a "special revelation" of past facts, *e.g.* the process of creation, or the origins of tribal history, is contradicted by analogy' (p. 31).

Mr. Ottley explains 'the extent to which the results of historical criticism' are taken for granted in these lectures by regarding as 'established results' the statement 'of Professor Sanday in the second and third of his lectures on Inspiration' (pp. 32-3). That is to say, that Mr. Ottley holds that 'it has been rendered most probable and even morally certain that the active ministry of the prophets preceded the discipline of the law, at least in its completed form' (p. 33); and that it has been shown 'with unquestionable clearness and force that there are at least three main strata of laws incorporated in the Pentateuch' (p. 35). After this, leaving the story of the 'origins' for his next lecture, Mr. Ottley brings his introductory lecture to a conclusion with some remarks on our Lord's authority, and the experience of Christians with respect to the Bible.

In the second lecture Mr. Ottley says that the five aspects of the Old Testament upon which he proposes to dwell are : (1) The Old Testament a history of redemption ; (2) The Old Testament the history of a progressive revelation ; (3) The Old Testament traces the history of a covenantal relationship ; (4) The Old Testament and the Messianic hope ; (5) The Old Testament witnesses to a Divine purpose for the individual. The 'narrative of the origins,' we are told, clearly stands 'on a different level from the historical books properly so-called ;' it is 'cast in a quasi-historical or mythical form,' and 'the current traditions of the creation, the fall, and the flood are employed as a suitable medium for expressing the fundamental thoughts of true religion,' and 'primitive myth is consecrated to spiritual uses' (p. 57). 'The narrative of the fall is to be regarded as a particular solution, in poetical form, of a problem which at a very early period presented itself to human thought' (p. 59). The details of the story of the flood 'may appear to curious inquirers contradictory or even impossible,' and Christians 'are not concerned to maintain that the narrative as it stands is literally correct' (pp. 60-1). If we are to seek a principle which is to reassure us that this

is the right way of regarding the early parts of the Bible, we find it apparently in a sentence in the first lecture, which we are inclined to regard as the heart of the whole book, and which we should adopt as our own with no sort of confidence: 'Since Christian faith has welcomed the theory of development in nature, it has no reason to fear an evolutionary account of Hebrew religion' (p. 44). We should rather say that since we have always received theories of developments in nature with the utmost caution, we have all the more reason to be extremely careful when evolutionary processes are applied to the inspired records of the Hebrew religion.

In the third lecture, Mr. Ottley approaches a very important and central part of his subject. In regarding the Old Testament as the history of redemption, and saying that the sacred writers were, in Mr. Green's phrase, 'hushed before their sense of a mighty deliverance,' to wit the exodus, which profoundly affected the point of view from which the whole subsequent history was studied, Mr. Ottley rightly conceives that he has before him 'the very heart of the matter' (p. 158). But to see what his conception is worth we must look at his view of 'the historical element in the Old Testament' (p. 101). His mode of speaking about 'the Hexateuch and the historical books' (observe the differentiation) as 'highly composite narratives;' about the Hexateuch as 'a highly ingenious and elaborate mosaic constructed out of materials of very different historical value;' about the written documents available for constructing the history of Israel as containing 'quasi-historical narratives;' and his presentation of the work of the modern historian as the problem 'to disentangle from its ideal or imaginative embodiment the genuine historical nucleus which unquestionably underlies the record,' prepare us for his general statement of the case (pp. 101-3). After making allowance for 'the actual or probable results of archaeological research,' and declaring that 'a Christian reader of the Old Testament will feel no *a priori* difficulties in regard to the occurrence of miracles' (pp. 105-6), Mr. Ottley surveys three distinct epochs of the history of Israel. The patriarchal age is, 'relatively speaking, pre-historic,' and 'there may possibly be an element of truth even in the view that the figures of the patriarchs are tribal personifications,' though if we read Renan's *Histoire du Peuple d'Israël* we may 'derive from it a very strong impression of the general truth of the patriarchal story' (pp. 109, 111, 160). The period of Mosaism, which is Mr. Ottley's second epoch, is 'comparatively solid' ground (p. 131). Moses and the Exile are 'assured historical

realities.' So important is Jehovah's deliverance and guidance of His chosen people, that it 'seems to live in the religious consciousness of the Pentateuchal writers, and perhaps somewhat overpowers or dims their interest in historical details' (p. 134). Therefore, in the Pentateuch, 'we are not dealing with history in the ordinary sense of that term, but with an idealized and partly prophetic picture' (p. 144). 'Firm historical ground' is only reached in the third epoch, when we come to what Mr. Ottley confesses to be the historical books and prophecies. Of course the usual procession of 'ancient materials,' 'later editors,' and 'additions and interpretations in the post-exilic period' passes before us even here (p. 145).

We are now able to form an idea of Mr. Ottley's Bible. He is not conscious apparently that he has given up anything worth having. He has modified his traditional views, if he ever held them; he has gained larger, higher, and deeper conceptions of the Divine methods of dealing with men; and he is able to use the Bible just as much for Christian teaching as before, though in different, or as he would say modified, ways. That is his view, and as we do not share it we are surprised that Mr. Ottley can feel so happy about it.

In the succeeding lectures history makes more room for theology, and first comes the subject of the progressiveness and content of the Divine self-revelation. Mr. Ottley illustrates this subject by general features of Hebrew revelation in the spheres of worship and of ethical ideas and by the progressive unfolding of the name of God. This involves, at all events briefly, a consideration of several important topics, such as sacrifice in general, the Decalogue—which Mr. Ottley accepts as 'an original monument of Mosaism' (p. 172), though 'it would be misleading to speak of Mosaism as if it embraced a formal system of ethics' (p. 171)—human sacrifice, the slaughter of the Canaanites, anthropomorphic language, and the attributes and Fatherhood of God. Mr. Ottley observes that 'the Old Testament exhibits not merely an inevitable evolution of human thought, but a progressive self-manifestation of God' (p. 165). But it may be well to remember that evolution may move in two ways, either towards progress or decay, and if the Bible contains instances of both processes in the history of man, we must be very cautious in acknowledging 'the debt which theology owes to the evolutionary conception of Israel's history and theology' (p. 205). We believe that that conception has very much to answer for, and that does not seem to have occurred to Mr. Ottley.

On the ancient covenant and its worship, when the Decalogue and the sanctuary with its sacrifices are considered in fuller detail, Mr. Ottley exhibits considerable hesitation. He sets out with the purpose of examining the idea and requirement of covenant relationship in general, the institutions which typified its spiritual truth and their fulfilment in our Lord Jesus Christ (p. 209). Here really of course he is face to face with the great theory of Wellhausen, and, we may add, with Mr. Baxter's reply. He should here come to a clear conclusion on certain crucial points, but in no part of his subject more than here does he seem to halt between two opinions, to waver in a strait betwixt two, or, as he would probably say, to make good his claim of '*a via media*' (Pref. p. vii). We naturally ask, Was the Decalogue, if Mosaic, the only part of the law of Moses? Was there, in fact, an actual tabernacle, the one sanctuary? And were the sacrifices, which are so minutely described in the Pentateuch, only the production of post-exilic Judaism. Wellhausen's assertions about the one sanctuary and the sacrifices if they be boldly reiterated without proof, are at all events as clear as they can be. Nor is there an uncertain sound about the examination of the critical position on the part of Mr. Baxter or Professor Robertson. But Mr. Ottley gives us the impression, not of standing firmly upon the strength of a sound *via media*, but of shifting hither and thither, as he is drawn first by one assertion or piece of evidence and then by another, not supposing that either view is of much consequence in its religious aspect, and on the whole accepting the main conclusions of the critical side. A few quotations will make this clear: 'For our present purpose . . . it is immaterial whether the traditional view (of the date of the origin of the covenantal idea) is correct, or whether Wellhausen, Stade, and others are justified in asserting that the relation between Jehovah and Israel was only thus conceived first in the prophetic period' (p. 210). But 'there is good reason to suppose that the idea had its foundation in pre-prophetic times,' although, according to 'the prophetic survey of the national history which we find in the book of Deuteronomy,' the Decalogue and not the ritual law was the peculiar characteristic of the Mosaic system (pp. 211-2). On the antiquity and contents of the Decalogue, to which Mr. Ottley again alludes in this lecture (see above, p. 172) we are glad to see his remark that 'the traditional view, even if it has to be slightly modified, is essentially justifiable' (p. 216), and as the atmosphere of the Pusey House has been somewhat too prominently socialistic for our taste, we also

welcome the observation that the second table 'enjoins respect for the life *and property* of others' (p. 218). 'The absence of any directions bearing upon worship' (p. 220) does not at all seem to us a 'striking feature' of the Decalogue. It gives general principles and not details of duty, and it tells us to worship God only, truly, reverently, and regularly in accord with the way in which it teaches us to behave towards our neighbour with respect, kindness, purity, honesty, truth, and contentment. Again, looking at matters from the religious point of view, we are told that 'it makes no material difference whether the sketch (of the sanctuary and worship of Israel) is strictly faithful to historical fact, or whether it is a partially ideal creation.' They 'may or may not have been institutions actually realized in detail,' but in any case 'the description of them has a providential and didactic purpose' and 'the religious *idea* is present' (p. 225). However, 'the critics appear to be justified in maintaining that the description of the tabernacle in the book of Exodus is very highly idealized' (p. 226). 'Hebrew tradition appears to know practically nothing of such a shrine (as the sumptuous tabernacle described in the book of Exodus) in pre-exilic days' (*ibid*). A simple Mosaic tent, largely coloured by reminiscences or traditions of the splendid Temple of Solomon, is the admission to which our Christian apologist inclines. Passing to the sacrifices in the Pentateuch, they are to be regarded as 'based on pre-existing customs.' As codified in the Pentateuch, however, the sacrificial usage, which there is 'every reason to suppose existed in germ even at the earliest period of Israel's national history,' represents what was at least intended to be observed in the post-exilic temple (p. 231). And such a critical analysis of the Pentateuch 'relieves us of a difficulty' (p. 232). We do not follow Mr. Ottley into the details or the Christian significance of particular sacrifices, except to notice that Mr. Jevons's testimony¹ leads to a very different conclusion from Mr. Ottley's remark that the slaying of the victim in the classes of sacrifices mentioned on p. 236 'seems to have had no independent significance,' and to note the illustration of legitimate typical interpretation based on the work of Mr. Willis on p. 261.

'The prophets and the law,' then, is the order in which the general results of Old Testament criticism might be summed up, as accepted by Mr. Ottley, and it is to Prophecy and the Messianic hope that we are next conducted. We shall not follow our author into the details of his treatment

¹ *Introduction to the History of Religion*, pp. 231-2

of the history, the nature, or the aspects of the prophets' office, nor trace with him the growth of the Messianic hope. A few points must, however, be noticed. The book of Jonah 'was probably written in the post-exilic period,' and was 'mainly didactic' in its design (p. 292). There are incidents, we are told, in the Old Testament 'respecting which a large latitude of opinion is surely desirable. Some, for instance, may regard the story of Jonah as literally true';¹ others see good reason for finding in it an allegorical narrative written with a didactic purpose' (p. 379). The blessing of Jacob is 'so-called' (p. 297). The Twenty-second Psalm, the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, the story of Job, are to be reckoned among the passages which 'seem to embody the deepened spiritual experience of the exile' (p. 310). And in language which has been re-echoed in recent correspondence on the teaching of the Old Testament, we are told that 'the study of the Old Testament may most appropriately begin with the prophets, not only because the date of their activity and the authenticity of their works are in the main certain and undisputed, but also because their writings will give us the true point of view from which to approach the entire history and institutions of Israel' (p. 322). We are now seriously told that this is the way to begin to teach the Old Testament to the young! We have hitherto considered that 'God the Father made me' and 'God the Son redeemed me' because I needed redemption, and 'God the Holy Ghost sanctifieth me,' were the essential elements of the inspired story of the Creation and the Fall, necessary for all the young, and we frankly say that we shall continue so to begin the Old Testament, and so to teach it to the end.

The seventh lecture comments on the idea of a future life, the idea of a personal providence, and the sense of the fruitfulness of suffering, as the foundation truths of personal religion in the Old Testament, seeking information on these points chiefly in the books of the Hagiographa. These books are said for the most part to 'bear witness to the zeal, literary culture, and religious devotion of the post-exilic age' (p. 329). It will be observed that Mr. Ottley is in no danger of falling into the 'serious mistake' of supposing 'that the post-exilic age was a barren period in the religion of Israel' (p. 328). So much is deported from other periods and deponed in the

¹ We cordially commend Dr. Townsend's little book on *The Story of Jonah in the Light of the Higher Criticism* (Funk & Wagnalls, 1897). His account of James Bartley, who repeated Jonah's wonderful experience, and lived to tell the tale, illustrates his argument, p. 69.

recesses of the post-exilic age, that it becomes in Mr. Ottley's picture almost the only spot that is not barren. The book of Daniel, says the late Pusey Librarian, was 'apparently composed as a manual of consolation for the professors and martyrs of the Maccabean period,' and 'is a specimen of prophecy in its later apocalyptic form' (p. 331). The book of Ecclesiastes, 'though ascribed to the Hebrew monarch . . . reflects the condition of a paganism that is practically bankrupt' (p. 367).

In the concluding lecture Mr. Ottley sums up his position and deals with several matters of obviously very great importance, the use of the Old Testament by New Testament writers, and the permanent function of the Old Testament in the Church. With much that is said in this lecture we are in cordial agreement, but then we are so because we believe that it fits in so harmoniously with the traditional view of the Old Testament, and cannot be reconciled with Mr. Ottley's new critical ideas. The New Testament ascribes three main characteristics, says Mr. Ottley, to the Old Testament, the fragmentary character of the revelation contained in it, the variety of its methods, and its rudimentary character (pp. 377-9). Mr. Ottley imagines that the New Testament teaching about the purpose and function of the law is unaffected by the transposition of the law from the time of Moses to the time of Ezra (pp. 380-381). He says that 'Christ and His apostles assign to the Old Testament a unique and inviolable authority' (p. 381), and that this must not be overlooked, that our Lord refers to Moses, Daniel, or David, in accordance with the current literary conceptions of His time, and that the books to which He most commonly refers—Deuteronomy, the Psalms, and Isaiah—are those which are most full of the Messianic element. As to the principles of our Lord's references, or as Mr. Ottley says, in a way which does not seem to us to be the mode in which St. Athanasius would have spoken, 'the principles which appear to *guide* our Lord and the New Testament writers' (p. 383), our author considers them in the light of the traditional rules of interpretation among the scribes. Our Lord 'left the *Halachah*,' or exegetical expansion of the law, 'untouched, and scarcely noticed' (p. 386). He appears to set it aside as 'quite secondary' (*ibid.*). His 'favourite method of teaching' (p. 388) was the *Haggadah*, or 'narrative or legend by which the Old Testament history was enlarged, illustrated, or homiletically enforced' (p. 384). We do not merely infer the conclusion from the facts on which Mr. Ottley bases these statements, that our Lord 'lifted high once more

the standard of prophetism' (p. 386) at the expense of the law, which was 'shown to occupy its rightful place' (p. 382), but rather that the Sermon on the Mount, the Life and Death of our Lord, show how the ancient Law given on Sinai was fulfilled in the Person of the one Divine Lawgiver when he became Incarnate, and so in Him was fully kept once for all by all His members. The third method, *Sodh*, by which the mystical or allegorical sense of a passage was elicited, may also be 'illustrated from Christ's own teaching,' but 'seems on the whole to have been more characteristic of Hellenistic than of Palestinian Judaism,' and 'undoubtedly plays a large part in apostolic exegesis' (p. 385). Other remarks on the apostolic usage of the first two modes are also made (p. 388), and Mr. Ottley then concludes that the most striking features of the New Testament exegesis of the Old are its remarkable breadth and freedom, the moral import of the quotations, and the view of the Old Testament as an organic whole to which the Messiah and His Kingdom are the key (pp. 389, 393, 396). We can quote a passage on Christ as the light of all Scripture to His Apostles and His believing Church, which strikes the true note of Scriptural study, and we wish that all the book could have been written in accordance with it:

'We cannot for a moment suppose that with His unique spiritual insight our Lord could mistake the real character of the Scriptures to which He so solemnly appeals. That He penetrates to the very heart of their meaning, that He assigns to each part of them the exact significance they were divinely intended to convey, that He grasped unerringly their general drift and their precise bearing on His own work and mission, it is simply impossible to doubt' (pp. 399, 400).

We assent to that heart and soul, but we cannot reconcile it with the so-called 'assured results' which Mr. Ottley accepts from the school of Wellhausen. On the next page we are again far removed from Mr. Ottley's position. His 'final word' on the historical character of the Old Testament records is that 'we must recognize frankly the impossibility of precisely determining the historical value of the narratives in which Israel's history is contained' (p. 401). After a passage on the propriety of mystical interpretation (pp. 405-411), where one of our own articles is mentioned (p. 405),¹ we reach the concluding topic of the permanent function of the Old Testament, discussed in the light of our own day, and forming a summary of the subject (p. 412). With the heads of this function we have no quarrel. The Old Testament is

¹ In No. 43, April, 1886, on 'The Mystical Interpretation of Holy Scripture.'

a revelation of God's nature and character, it witnesses to Christ, it forms and trains character, it is a manual for the spiritual life, an instructor in social righteousness, and an aid in New Testament exegesis (pp. 412-33). The details, of course, are coloured by the conclusions which Mr. Ottley has accepted, and in the matter of the moral teaching by that socialistic bias to which we have already referred. Mr. Ottley's special summary of his subject will be found on pp. 436-7, and he concludes with two reflections to reassure his readers. In the first place he considers that no Christian believer needs to cast away his faith because a new conception of the Old Testament has been accepted by him, and in the second place he warns those who do not feel the force of the appeal made by the historical criticism to beware of an exaggerated or one-sided conception of the Bible (pp. 437, 440).

We also will conclude with two remarks. We profoundly regret that these lectures were delivered upon the Bampton Trust, and we consider that Mr. Ottley has mistaken many shifting sands of critical assumption for the solid rock of Divine truth.¹

ART. II.—DR. PUSEY.

Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey, Doctor of Divinity, Canon of Christ Church, Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford. By HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., late Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. Edited and prepared for publication by the Rev. J. O. JOHNSTON, M.A., Principal of Cuddesdon Theological College, and the Rev. ROBERT J. WILSON, D.D., late Warden of Keble College, and the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. In four volumes. Vol. IV. (1860-1882.) With Portrait and Illustrations. (London, New York, and Bombay, 1897.)

CHURCHMEN may well share in the 'happiness' which 'the editors' of 'this great work' 'feel' in being 'allowed at length to complete' it (Preface, p. xi). And perhaps it may not be out of place to congratulate in particular the 'editor' to whose labour, as we understand, the present volume is chiefly due, whose privilege it has been to be associated with the

¹ Professor Bevan gives a compendious account of the controversy in the first of the *Stafford House Lectures* (S.P.C.K. 1897).

publication of the *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey* from the beginning to the end. If the few pages of this volume which Dr. Liddon wrote (pp. 377-86), with their pathetic account of Dr. Pusey's last illness and death, renew our regret that he was not spared to complete the book, it is a matter for great satisfaction that what he began should have been so worthily finished, and that it should be possible to read this concluding volume without any sense of unfitness that it, like the first three volumes, bears his highly honoured name.

The writing and publication of the whole book has been a great act of justice. 'From the first,' we are told,

'Dr Liddon was determined that the story of Dr. Pusey's Life should readjust the balance of those partial histories of the Oxford Movement which had appeared before 1882, and should cause his great friend to stand out in Church History in his rightful place' (Preface, p. xi).

From the time of Dr. Pusey's serious illness in 1878, 'Liddon'

'took every opportunity of getting Pusey to dictate to him the story of the great events in which he had taken so conspicuous a part' (p. 309);

in 1879 he mentioned his 'wish' that he 'could resign' his 'Professorship and set to writing a Life of' Pusey (p. 339); and on Pusey's death in 1882 he carried out this wish, and 'put aside as far as possible all other literary labours' in order that he might 'adequately' 'discharge the task' thus 'undertaken' (Preface to vol. i. p. vi).

It is interesting to observe that the present volume resembles the earlier volumes in carrying out part of this object of the work by its removal of various misconceptions of Dr. Pusey's actions and character. Few ideas about him have, we suppose, been more persistently prevalent than the supposition that, because of his theological differences with Professor Jowett, he used his influence and powers to prevent the increase of the stipend of the Regius Professor of Greek from the miserably inadequate sum of 38*l.* a year. The facts here told show that, so far from being unwilling that such an increase should be made, he gave much thought and labour, incurred misunderstandings, and separated himself from some of his friends, in order to try and devise a plan by means of which the Greek Professor might receive an adequate stipend without any seeming approval of his heterodox views. Whether or no the opinion which the editors suggest without approving is right,

XUM

18

't
m
on
it'

it
wi
th
se
He
the
to
thi
lib

tud
dis
and
wri
find

clou
very
a so

Darv
the v
same
servi
(p. 6
logy

theor
man's
ape-a
ficient

Haec
æons
has re
Being

And
scient

By
metho
to sci
witness

VOD

XUM

'that it would have been best to acquiesce in the measure' of augmentation originally proposed, 'as an act of justice, and to let anyone who would make what controversial advantage he could out of it' (pp. 11-12),

it is now abundantly clear that it was Dr. Pusey's earnest wish that Professor Jowett should be fairly dealt with, and that his object all through the painful controversy was to secure that of two desirable objects neither should be lost. Henceforth to speak of him as having attempted to injure a theological opponent by pecuniary meanness, as we are sorry to know some have spoken of him since the publication of this volume, is a mark either of culpable ignorance or of deliberate untruth.

It is commonly said, again, that Dr. Pusey's whole attitude towards physical science was one of hostility. That he distrusted much in the methods of prominent scientific men, and in particular was strongly opposed to some parts of the writings of Mr. Darwin, is unquestionably true. Thus we find him writing to Professor Rolleston in 1879:

'The theory of Evolution seems to me one of the threatening clouds of the day. I fear that it will wreck the faith of many. It is very fascinating to a certain class of minds, and seems already to be a sort of Gospel. . . .

'Darwin's *Descent of Man* was very distressing to me. Hitherto, Darwin had, in all his illustrations, kept himself to scientific facts, the variations or, if so be, fresh species of animals or plants of the same kind. In the *Descent of Man*, he claims to have done good service in "aiding to overthrow the doctrine of separate creations" (p. 61). He accepts, as you know, in principle all Haeckel's genealogy of our ancestors. . . .

'To me, it would seem to stultify the whole of the Darwinian theory, to suppose a mere natural development up to man, including man's body, and then to suppose that this descendant from its ape-ancestors was, at once, endowed by God with all those magnificent gifts with which the Bible says He endowed us. . . .

'I do not myself see the slightest difference between Darwin and Haeckel, except that Darwin assumes a First Cause, who, all those æons ago, infused the breath of life into some primeval forms, and has remained inactive (if, indeed, He is supposed to be a Personal Being) ever since' (p. 336).

And he plainly showed in 1845 his disapproval of certain scientific teachers (p. 331).

But this thoughtful and earnest opposition to particular methods and theories was in no way the outcome of hostility to scientific inquiry itself. Sir Henry Acland has borne witness that

'in the year 1855 the final vote of 30,000*l.* for the construction of the Museum would have been lost without the votes of Dr. Pusey, Charles Marriott, and their friends' (p. 332).

Ten years later, at the Norwich Church Congress, he read a paper on the relations between Revelation and Science, for which he received the thanks of Professor Rolleston in the following terms:

'I am very much obliged to you for your Norwich address. I wish all writing on the subject had been in the same spirit of caution and courage: and I hope it will be widely read, as it will prevent much mischief being done to the cause of Revelation, on the one side by its foes and on the other by its friends' (p. 81).

And his great sermon, preached in 1878, entitled *Unscience, not Science, Adverse to Faith*, is thus summarized in the volume before us:

'He begins by asking the question why, in the present day, in sad contrast with the past, the study of Physical Science is so often adverse to continued belief in God and in His Revealed Truth. The sphere of Science is material fact, the sphere of Theology spiritual fact. Why should they be in conflict? True genuine Theology has no preconceived opinions in the province of Science; it has room for all the facts, and even for the most romantic imaginations of Science, if those imaginations are confined to its own region. The danger to faith has arisen first from the study of the phenomena of matter to the rigid exclusion of the phenomena of the spiritual world, and in a forgetfulness of the Existence of God, more contemptuous than positive denial; and, secondly, from the intrusive attempt on the part of material Science to explain from beneath spiritual facts about the soul's existence, about religion and about morals. Theories of the evolution of the world and of animal forms may or may not be true. "Theology does not hold them excluded by Holy Scripture, so that they spare the soul of man." The powers of the human soul, especially its power to know God and be in communion with Him, and above all, its powers as shown in the Mind and Life of Jesus Christ, His attractive beauty, His wondrous reign, and His continued daily miracles, attest its true origin' (p. 334).

It is no part of our present task to discuss the attitude taken up in this Sermon, or to enter into the criticisms which have been passed upon it from opposing points of view;¹ it is

¹ It is, however, interesting, as marking the impression made by Dr. Pusey's Sermon, to notice that on Sunday, November 10, 1878, just a week after the delivery of it, Professor Jowett, preaching in Balliol College Chapel, said 'We may say if we like that religion and science move upon two different planes, and are like parallel lines which never touch; but the truth is that they are touching everywhere and in all times, in our minds and bodies, in education, in social and political life, in the

sufficient that we should call attention to the proofs which it affords of the welcome which Dr. Pusey was prepared to give to genuine scientific study, and to the fact that the editors of the *Life* are able to say :

‘His statement of the position between Theology and Physical Science was to many of his readers entirely new ; the line of demarcation has been sadly blurred by ignorant attacks on Revealed Religion, and equally ignorant attempts to defend it. Several well-known men of science, some of whom could by no means be reckoned on the side of Christianity, thanked Pusey heartily for it. “We have no right,” one says, speaking as a scientific teacher, “to complain of dogmatism, for the scientific men of the day surpass the theologians in this. Haeckel indeed speaks like the Pope. The earlier part of your sermon pleased me most as an important step towards peace, which everyone wishes for, provided it may be obtained without the sacrifice of truth.” Another welcomed the sermon as “an Eirenicon, as the preliminaries of peace between genuine science and genuine theology”’ (p. 335).

Another point on which this volume goes far to make Dr. Pusey’s position clear is that of Ritual. We find in his letters and speeches on this subject a great unwillingness to change established customs, a strong sense of the harm which may be done by forcing ritual upon congregations unprepared for it, and a fear lest the inner life of the spirit may be injured instead of being helped by ceremonial. But he affirmed

history of the world ; and therefore, if the speculative reconciliation of science and religion seem at the present moment to be distant and improbable, we should struggle to attain the practical reconcilment of them in our own lives, not allowing mere scientific notions, whether physical or metaphysical, to extinguish in our minds the love of God or the power of prayer, nor on the other hand suffering the intensity of religious or devotional feeling to do violence to our sense of truth’ (Jowett, *College Sermons*, pp. 84-5). Seven years earlier, preaching before the University on November 26, 1871, Professor Jowett had used the following language : ‘There seem to be signs that the opposition between religion and science, faith and knowledge, of which we have heard so much, is fading away. For there is no real separation between truth and goodness ; but for a time, and owing to some misunderstanding, they appear to part company. The novelties of science, like any other novelties, slowly find their way ; the conjectures of science or criticism we are not called upon to accept until they are proven to us. Religious men are beginning to be aware that they must not deny any true fact of history or science. Scientific men are becoming conscious that human life cannot be reconstructed out of the negative results of criticism or the dry bones of science. The first thoughts of persons often are : this is at variance with what I learnt in childhood, with what I read in Scripture, with what I hear from the pulpit. Their second thoughts are that no truth can be at variance with any other truth, and that they must patiently wait for the reconcilment of them’ (*ibid.* pp. 75-6).

again and again the claims of the Prayer Book to complete obedience, and was emphatic in his support of ritual which is the exponent of Catholic truth. Thus, when 'the vicar of one of the most advanced churches was about to resign in despair' during the trying days of 1877, he 'wrote' in the following terms 'to beg him to change his mind':

'My very dear Friend,

Liddon tells me that you speak of resigning. Pray do not. The battle is not lost. But it would be lost, if those who are to fight it resign. Each individual encourages or discourages. You have a prominent post. I would gladly go to prison for you. But I can't.

"O fortes, pejoraque passi

Mecum saepe viri . . .

Nil desperandum Christo duce et auspice Christo"

has been my motto for many years of trouble.

'Yours very affectionately,

'E. B. PUSEY' (pp. 290-1).

Similarly, four years later, when the Rev. S. F. Green was in prison for refusing to comply with a judgment of Lord Penzance's court, he wrote to the Hon. C. L. Wood, now Viscount Halifax:

'Lord Penzance's jurisdiction is made then as stringent as human law can make it. Our efforts to obtain Mr. Green's freedom and restore him to the people whom he loves and who love him, and some of whom must owe their souls to him, have failed: and he lies a State prisoner in a felon's gaol. It might have been my own case, if the persecuting party had been consistent. For the same judgment which forbade wearing and using what the letter of the Prayer Book directs, forbade also our celebrating the Holy Eucharist as our Blessed Lord celebrated it, in wine mingled with water. I did it, and called the attention of the persecuting party to my doing it. I had not the same strong ground as Mr. Green, for there is no direction in our Prayer Book to mingle water with the wine, but only a custom since our Lord instituted it. No Church court, no consistory, no jury of twelve honest Englishmen could have said that a clergyman ought to be sent to prison for doing what the letter of the Prayer Book bids him do. Had the persecutors obtained a sentence against me for celebrating Holy Communion as our Blessed Lord did, in wine mingled with water, I must have been writing this in the Castle at Oxford. I challenged them to do their worst.

'I only mention my own case because it looks so selfish to talk quietly about Mr. Green's remaining in Lancaster Castle, while one's self is in God's free air, unless one had had to face the same result; and not I only, but he too, to whom throngs are listening in hushed silence in St. Paul's. . . . Mr. Green must lie, deprived of the power of working directly for souls and for his Lord, unless he will own, in fact, that he did amiss in following a distinct direction of the Prayer Book, and giving to his people a service which they loved.

'V
men's
dwelle
Only
doors
willet

D
Old
with
writte
ledge
theor
his d
of H
fully
to ov
ship
in his
their
lectur
which
oppos
groun
on D
gener
They
edito
them

'E
assert
at a v
this as
young
. . .
from s
from t
prophe
sion is
racter
it mus
tific cr
the wr
the mi
warrant
feature
Scriptu
all ava

'We can do nothing. The prison is shut with all safety, and men's wills are more iron than the locks. But "the Lord who dwelleth on high is mightier." He "looseth men out of prison." Only let us ask Him earnestly, and He will either open the prison doors, or make this prolonged imprisonment be, in what way He willeth and knoweth, to His Glory' (pp. 366-7).

Dr. Pusey's attitude on the subject of the criticism of the Old Testament is more widely and better known than that with regard to the matters about which we have so far written. He possessed a most complete and accurate knowledge of Hebrew; he was intimately acquainted with the theories and arguments of the various schools of criticism of his day; the main work of his life was the study of the text of Holy Scripture. With these qualifications, he had carefully weighed all the considerations by which some thought to overthrow the traditional views of the dates and authorship of the books of the Old Testament, and was unhesitating in his conviction that these writers had failed to make out their case. His *Commentary on the Minor Prophets* and his lectures on the Book of Daniel show alike the care with which he had considered the contentions of those who were opposed to the traditional views and the solidity of the grounds upon which he based his own beliefs. The lectures on Daniel were the outcome of a statement in and the general position of the work entitled *Essays and Reviews*. They were delivered in the years 1862 and 1863. The editors of the *Life* thus describe the object and character of them:

'He selected the Book of Daniel because Dr. Williams had asserted that recent criticism had proved that the book was written at a very late date; and Pusey was convinced that if he could show this assertion to be untrue, it would shake the confidence of the younger students of theology in other supposed critical triumphs. . . . *Essays and Reviews* and the serious harm that was resulting from such methods of handling the Old Testament, and especially from the hints thrown out which tended to disparage the value of prophecy, are throughout present to his mind. The whole discussion is focussed upon the question of the definitely predictive character of the book. Arguments are carefully marshalled to show that it must indisputably contain predictions, because trustworthy scientific criticism cannot assign any date to it so late as the events which the writer treats as being still in the future. He refused to regard the minuteness of some of the predictions as giving the slightest warrant for a suspicion of their authenticity; he pointed out that this feature rendered them all the more in harmony with the rest of Scripture. With elaborate care he argued, from a comparison of all available materials, that not only the character of the Hebrew of

the book exactly suited the traditional date of composition, but that the form of the Chaldee, in which language six of its chapters are written, excluded any later date from consideration. He maintained that the minute, fearless touches, involving details of customs, State-institutions, and history, belong to one who must have lived in the period which he described; and that the passages which appeared to present historical difficulties are really, when considered in the light of full knowledge, indications of an accurate and familiar acquaintance with all details which could only belong to a contemporary, as Professor Ramsay has triumphantly shown in the case of the writer of the Acts of the Apostles. Further, he maintained that the theology of Daniel was exactly what would be expected from a Jew living during the Babylonian captivity. . . . He read every work that had been written against the traditional account of the Book of Daniel, and spared no pains of research to discover facts which would throw light upon the difficulties which seemed to crave for solution. In this volume, as in the *Commentary on the Minor Prophets*, he thus noted carefully every recent theory; and his scholarship throughout is marked with the usual characteristics of thoroughness and trustworthiness. . . . These lectures on Daniel are acknowledged not only to be replete with learning, but also to sum up with masterly ability the conservative position with respect to this part of the Bible. . . . He had ever before him those forms of German unbelief with which forty years earlier he had become painfully familiar at Göttingen, and from which these theories originally emanated; and he saw, behind the first English skirmish with these old German foes, the whole advancing host of Rationalism. Whether rightly or wrongly, he desired by strong language to awaken English readers to the vital questions involved in the controversy, as he understood it. Some of the Essayists, as clergymen, had gained a reputation for boldness by raising questions which, as a matter of fact, insinuated to many minds an unbelief which they did not openly state. Pusey could see no frankness or candour in such a proceeding, and he desired to tear aside the veil which hid from the public eye the source of their arguments and the issue to which he was convinced that they would ultimately lead, and to stamp it all as "unbelief." He did not mean that all who held this position were "unbelievers"; he allowed that many honestly thought it possible to combine such criticism with a firm hold of the Faith. But he wished to point out that in his opinion they were on an inclined plane, and must eventually either discard their criticism or surrender their belief' (pp. 71-4).¹

¹ It is with great regret that we feel constrained to record our wish that two or three sentences in the paragraph which follows the above quotation on p. 74 had been differently expressed. After reading it carefully several times, we have little doubt that it is meant to be a cautiously worded statement, aiming at doing justice to a line of thought which the editors themselves do not accept. A hasty reader might easily think it the outcome of a suspicion that in his general view of the theological aspect of certain critical opinions about the Old Testament Dr. Pusey was fundamentally wrong. And, while careful observation of the exact

It
Univ
curre
Testa
entile
delive
his he
That
A
effort
realit
Engla
separ
Chris
the p
Faith
same
result
under
the r
the fa
satisfy
Newm
might
Forbe
regar
stanti
outwa
Churo
that n
shown
the C
affirm
made
sition
Creed
Churo
was fu
of Ro
in the
to the
and fo

phrased
the last
Liddon

It is interesting to observe that his last sermon before the University, preached in 1878, 'was a protest against the current depreciation of the predictive element of the Old Testament' (p. 337). This sermon, like that of a week earlier, entitled *Unscience, not Science, Adverse to Faith*, was not delivered by Dr. Pusey himself, owing to the weak state of his health. It was read by the present Dean of Christ Church. That on the preceding Sunday was delivered by Dr. Liddon.

A large part of the volume is taken up with Dr. Pusey's efforts after Reunion. He had not the slightest doubt of the reality and fulness of the Sacramental life of the Church of England. He was convinced that a true Church might be separated from the See of Rome and isolated from the Christians of the East. He never wavered in his belief that the primary duty of English Churchmen was to preserve the Faith alike in its completeness and in its purity. At the same time he was painfully conscious of the losses which result from external disunion. The three works published under the title *Eirenicon*, his interviews with French bishops, the reprint of Cardinal de Turrecremata's masterly work on the failure of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception to satisfy any of the tests of truth, the correspondence with Newman on the exact meanings in which Transubstantiation might be affirmed or denied, the help given by him to Bishop Forbes's work on the Thirty-Nine Articles, especially with regard to Purgatory, the Invocation of Saints, and Transubstantiation, were all the outcome of his strong yearning to be outwardly united with his fellow-Christians in the Catholic Church. On the other hand, his vigorous hold on the fact that no good could be done by any disloyalty to truth was shown in his laying aside his hopes of speedy reunion with the Church of Rome when the Vatican Decrees had been affirmed in 1870, his caution with regard to the advances made to him by the Old Catholics, and his strenuous opposition to any tampering with the Western form of the Nicene Creed for the sake of possible gain in English relations to the Churches of the East. And even when his sanguine mind was full of hope that a basis of reconciliation with the Church of Rome might be found, he saw clearly how much there was in the Roman system, whether in those excesses of devotion to the Blessed Virgin which Newman described as 'unnatural and forced' (p. 107), and as seeming to him 'like a bad dream'

phraseology used seems to show that such an idea would be a mistake, the last sentence of all in the paragraph is one which we feel sure Dr. Liddon would have taken pains to avoid.

(p. 136), or in the practical methods 'taught by Liguori' (p. 123), which called for repudiation. That he was oversanguine few who read of his words and actions can doubt; of his deep faithfulness to truth there can be no question; if he failed utterly, we remember it was one of the most sober-minded of Englishmen who wrote, 'It is better to have tried and failed than not to have failed because we have not tried,'¹ and we heartily thank the editors of the *Life* for the passage in which they say:

'For the moment the principles of Ultramontanist had triumphed and Pusey seemed to have laboured in vain. Yet it would be a shallow estimate which would consign the *Eirenicon*, with all the loving work which it enshrined, to a corner in the lumber-room of costly failures and exploded Utopias. The immediate project had failed, but the cause of Re-union was not lost; rather in the end it will be found to have gained. However long God may defer the wished for end, the contemplation of these years of loving labour will still, as they have already done, kindle others to a like self-devotion. Their history exhibits a picture of no ordinary grandeur, — a noble soul daring to believe, amid the din of jarring controversy, that God is able to fulfil His own ideal, spreading the contagion of his faith to others, and toiling on through calumny and misrepresentation in his efforts to bring low the mountains that bar the way of the Lord. In spite of all, Pusey knew that he was on the winning side, and continued to pray, as he had prayed for thirty years, in "the Brotherhood of the Holy Trinity":—"Vouchsafe, we beseech Thee, O Lord, to grant to Thy faithful people unity, peace, and true concord, both visible and invisible, through Jesus Christ our Lord" (pp. 193-4).

Dr. Pusey said of himself that 'the thought of "Eirenica" had been a dream and interest of' his 'life' (p. 292). It was in the same spirit that he welcomed opportunities for acting in common with those from whom in many matters he was necessarily separated. In the controversy which arose out of the publication of *Essays and Reviews* he 'had great hopes that it would be possible to unite the Low Church and High Church parties' 'on such matters as Inspiration and the doctrine of Everlasting Punishment' (p. 50); it was a joy when a letter from him to the *Record* elicited a warm personal reply from Lord Shaftesbury (p. 51); eight years later it was a grief when he failed to obtain the support of the Low Church party in his battle on behalf of the Athanasian Creed (pp. 241-2).

The controversy which we have last mentioned supplies an instance of the force exercised by the resolute action of

¹ Church, *Cathedral and University Sermons*, p. 254.

strong
remov
of Eng
by Dr
port o
every
Dr. L
intent
were
comm
later
himse
Archb
Dean
been a
Creed
Regiu
Exege
versy
consul
expla
Oxford
Ch. A
in wh
tical v
retain
Engla
a note

'N
those
hinder

M
clarat
Church
in co
Lidd
select
had le
from
the u
allow
reform
of Co
unsati

strong men. A most strenuous attempt was made to remove the Athanasian Creed from the Service of the Church of England. The proposed removal was strongly advocated by Dr. Stanley, the Dean of Westminster, and had the support of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Tait. There was every prospect of the success of the attempt. Dr. Pusey and Dr. Liddon wrote to Bishop Wilberforce to express their intention of resigning their offices of teaching if the Creed were tampered with, and the contents of their letters were communicated by him to Archbishop Tait. Two months later Dr. Liddon wrote to the same effect to the Archbishop himself. The result was that the Creed was saved. The Archbishop abandoned his hopes of getting rid of it, and Dean Stanley expressed his sense of the influence which had been at work in a note in which he said that the 'use of the Creed' was retained 'out of deference to the scruples of' 'the Regius Professor of Hebrew and the Ireland Professor of Exegesis at Oxford' (p. 252). In the course of the controversy the Divinity Professors at Oxford and Cambridge were consulted as to the desirability of alterations in the Creed, or explanations of it, and a paper was written in reply by the Oxford Professors and signed by J. B. Mozley, E. B. Pusey, Ch. A. Ogilvie, C. A. Heurtley, W. Bright, and H. P. Liddon, in which they, in expressing their 'deep sense of the practical value' of the Creed and their hope that it might 'always retain its place in the public service' of the Church of England, submitted 'for consideration the following form of a note such as may tend to remove some misconceptions':

'Nothing in this Creed is to be understood as condemning those who, by involuntary ignorance or invincible prejudice are hindered from accepting the faith therein declared' (p. 238).

Much thought was spent by Dr. Pusey over the *Declaration on Confession and Absolution, as set forth by the Church of England*, published in 1873, which was the work in common of himself, Dr. Bright, Canon Carter, and Dr. Liddon. A petition to Convocation for the 'education, selection, and licensing of duly qualified Confessors' (p. 261) had led to much popular excitement; in reply to a memorial from the Church Association the two Archbishops had made the unhistorical statement, 'Our Reformers acted wisely in allowing' 'the system of the Confessional' 'no place in our reformed Church' (p. 262); a Committee of the Upper House of Convocation had drawn up a report which was not without unsatisfactory features (pp. 263-4). In view of these circum-

stances, the *Declaration* put out by Dr. Pusey and others affirmed the truths of the promise of 'forgiveness of sins through the Precious Blood of Jesus Christ,' the existence of a 'special means for the remission of sin after Baptism and for the relief of consciences' and the retention and administration of it by the Church of England 'as part of her Catholic heritage,' the gift of the power of Absolution to those ordained priests in the Church of England, the provision of words 'in the Book of Common Prayer for applying the absolving power to individual souls'; called attention to the instructions to the clergy in connexion with the Visitation of the Sick and the notice of Communion; went on to say that the 'command' of the Church of England to 'her priests in two of her offices to hear Confessions, if made,' could not 'be construed negatively into a command not to receive Confessions on any other occasions'; and ended by declaring, in connexion with a repudiation of any form of compulsory Confession, 'that all who, under the circumstances above stated, claim the privilege of private Confession are entitled to it, and that the clergy are directed under certain circumstances to "move" persons to such Confession' (pp. 266-70).

Dr. Pusey's part in this *Declaration* was in harmony with the practice and teaching of his life. The third volume of the work now before us told the pathetic history of his own seeking of Absolution; on many occasions he was careful to show the due place of Confession in the system of the Church; his aid as a Confessor was very largely sought; he spent no little time and trouble in the preparation of his edition of Gaume's *Manual for Confessors*; just before the beginning of his last illness he had given three or four days to hearing the confessions of the Ascot Sisters; as he lay dying he supposed that he was in the confessional and spoke the words of Absolution as he saw some kneeling by his bed. Not the least of the many great services of his life was his share, and it was a large one, in the restoration of Confession as a recognized feature of English Churchmanship.

The greater part of one chapter in the *Life* is devoted to the circumstances of the publication and the character of the book *What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?* Dr. Farrar had preached and published a series of sermons on the question of Eternal Punishment, which were marked by an unbalanced rhetoric and an inaccuracy of statement which were least of all appropriate to so solemn a subject, and which, as was afterwards found to be the case, had produced a very mistaken idea as to the real meaning of the preacher.

Dr. Pusey and in to the though work w editors

'Th of any s and pow ness of eye or d grasp of and clea he ever

'Th he first called ' Church opinion incur e predest unwarr "mater pretatio of man deal m twelve showed relative of the v great st tions t Lord's it : tha God." about t by the sion of bring o the inte process for the (PP. 35

A book, both s had m had b

Dr. Pusey felt strongly the necessity of exposing the blunders and inaccuracies of Dr. Farrar's book and of bringing back to the whole question the sobriety of mind and restraint of thought which any fitting consideration of it demands. The work which he wrote for this purpose is thus described by the editors of the *Life* :

'The reply is a book of nearly three hundred pages, the last book of any size which came from his pen, and one of the most well-timed and powerful. It is characterized by the minute accuracy and richness of detail that mark all his work. There is no sign of failure of eye or diminution of spiritual force : rather it might be said that in grasp of the full meaning of the position, in cogency of argument and clearness of statement, it equals and perhaps surpasses anything he ever wrote.

'The body of the book is the direct answer to Dr. Farrar. In it, he first sets forth the wide difference between what Dr. Farrar had called "the common opinions respecting hell" and the belief of the Church on the subject. According to Dr. Farrar, the "common opinions" included the belief that "the majority of mankind will incur everlasting punishment and are doomed to it by absolute predestination"; this Pusey showed is the teaching of Calvin and unwarranted by Scripture. The assertion that the "fire" of hell is "material" fire is by no means an essential part of the Church's interpretation of our Lord's words, and to maintain that "the vast mass of mankind die in a state of sin" implies that we know a great deal more about the secret things of God than is the case. In . . . twelve propositions he sums up the arguments which to his mind showed that the Revelation of Everlasting Punishment is the correlative of the fact of human freewill. . . . Passing to the discussion of the word *aiōnios*, and of the Jewish belief in Gehenna, on which great stress had been laid, he maintains by means of lengthy quotations that there is no trace of any doubt among the Jews of our Lord's day that punishment would be eternal for those who incurred it : that is, for those "who to the end would not have God as their God." The main argument concludes with some striking thoughts about the state of the departed, which seem to have been suggested by the recent passing away of so many of his friends. The discussion of the doctrine of Eternal Punishment seemed to him likely to bring out into far greater prominence the value of a right belief in the intermediate state, the comfort of believing in some purifying process after death, the happiness of that opportunity of preparing for the final Beatific Vision, and the value of prayer for the departed' (pp. 350-2).

A correspondence which followed the publication of this book, and was marked by high tone and good feeling on both sides, showed how greatly Dr. Farrar's rhetorical language had misrepresented his real belief. It now appeared that he had by no means intended to affirm Universalist opinions,

and did not deny the eternal punishment of the finally impenitent, and he accepted 'unreservedly' Dr. Pusey's 'twelve theses,' and expressed his 'main divergence from the view commonly supposed to be the sole orthodox one' as lying in the 'point that'

'whereas you and others hold that God may reach many souls, as He reached the soul of the penitent malefactor, in the hour of death, I have rather believed that the moment of death was not necessarily, and for all, the final irreversible moment of determination respecting the endless years beyond. I do not think that I have ever dwelt on the conception of a new "probation"; and I am perfectly willing to substitute for it the conception of a future "purification" for those who have not utterly extinguished the Grace of God in their hearts, if that be the more Catholic view' (p. 354).

The same correspondence afforded Dr. Pusey an opportunity of making clear that his own personal opinion was not in every respect limited to what he had laid down as essential to the faith, and in his first letter to Dr. Farrar he wrote thus:

'On two points you have thought that I was expressing my own personal belief when I did not mean to say anything of it. My object was to remove hindrances to the belief in God's awful judgments. I had no occasion to speak of myself. But as you have spoken of my faith, let me say—

'1. I was glad to be able to urge, after Divines of undisputed authority, that the belief that there are "pains of sense" in Hell is not essential to the belief in Hell itself, so that those who have a strong feeling against the belief in them need not, on that account, disbelieve Hell itself. There was no occasion to say that I do myself believe that there will be "pains of sense," although unutterably less than the "pain of the loss" of God. So I said nothing about myself; but it seems to me to have been the Christian belief from the first, and so I believe it.

'2. I do strongly hope that the great mass of mankind will be saved, all whom God could save without destroying their free agency. He does not draw us like stocks and stones, but as beings whom He has endowed with the power freely to love Him. But since God has only spoken of His Will to save us, and has not said whether mankind will accept that Will for them, I could have no *belief* on the subject. I left it blindly in the hands of God' (pp. 353-4).

This volume is not without indications, in addition to those which we have mentioned in connexion with the subject of Confession, of the pastoral spirit by which Dr. Pusey was animated. There is an instance in the speech which he delivered in 1865 at the Norwich Church Congress in favour of 'all sittings in church' being 'free and unappropriated,' which

was ma
a still m
dered d
London
a letter
1882, sc

'The
Hall, wh
a few yar
seizures a

'My
several n
the sick,
go to be
Wearied
Vestry th
breakfast
He had
His pleas
in a man
needed n
made me
had hear
give a gre
sanitary
doctors, n
assistant
in my ste
Quietly a
of Christ,
stricken h

'But
porary h
Superior
whose wis
pleasure t
Sisters, an
Bethnal C

Close
in educat
led him
legislatio
letters th
to Dr. L
sequence
Lord) C
Universi

was marked by deep sympathy with the poor (pp. 82-3); a still more striking illustration is in the service which he rendered during the 'visitation of cholera in the East End of London' (p. 141) in 1866. The beginning of it is told in a letter which the Rev. S. Hansard wrote to Dr. Liddon in 1882, soon after Dr. Pusey's death.

'The cholera was raging round the Parish Church and Town Hall, where the Vestry, under the Rector, assembled daily. Within a few yards of the Rectory and Town Hall, there were six sudden seizures and deaths in one morning.

'My curates were ill, unable to do any duty. I had been up for several nights running to two or three in the morning, attending to the sick, and more especially to the timid and fearful, who would not go to bed for fear of "the pestilence that walketh in darkness." Wearied and at my wits' end as to how I could possibly help my Vestry through their arduous duty, I had come down to a late breakfast at nine o'clock, when my servant announced Dr. Pusey. He had with him a letter of introduction from the Bishop . . . His pleasant smile, his genial manner, his hearty sympathy, expressed in a manner so winning and sincere, at once introduced him. He needed no letter. He not only put me at my ease at once, but he made me feel at one with him directly. During breakfast he said he had heard of my working single-handed just then, and as I must give a great portion of my time to my Vestry, upon whom fell all the sanitary work of the Parish, and this special work of providing doctors, medicine, and hospital, &c., as well, he offered to act as my assistant Curate, to visit the sick and dying whom I could not visit in my stead, and to minister to their spiritual wants. And he did so. Quietly and unobtrusively this true gentleman, this humble servant of Christ, assisted me in this most trying duty of visiting the plague-stricken homes of the poor of Bethnal Green.

'But this was not all. He came with the offer of a large temporary hospital for cholera patients. Miss Sellon, the Mother Superior of that most excellent Sisterhood, the Devonport Sisters, to whose wise beneficence and unweariness in well-doing it is a lasting pleasure to be grateful, would take charge of the hospital with her Sisters, and so she did; as she had done at Devonport, so she did at Bethnal Green' (pp. 142-3).

Closely connected with his pastoral spirit was his interest in education. Both that interest and his position at Oxford led him to face the questions which were presented by the legislation of his time with regard to the University. Two letters that call for careful attention were written by him, one to Dr. Liddon, the other to Mr. Gladstone, in 1868, in consequence of the Bill brought forward by Mr. (afterwards Lord) Coleridge 'for abolishing all those religious tests at the University which had been retained by the first University

Commission.' In these letters he said that he had 'long foreseen that some form of Denominationalism must sooner or later replace Establishments,' condemned 'an indifferentist education' as tending only to 'unnerve all earnestness and energy for good,' avowed his 'preference' for 'Denominationalism over Secularism,' and declared that he

'had far rather see the money of the Colleges taken, and Socinian, Baptist, Wesleyan, Presbyterian, and of course Roman Catholic Colleges endowed with it, than have Coleridge's Bill, according to which our laity and future Clergy are (as a condition of University training) to be exposed to Atheistic or any sort of God-denying teaching' (pp. 200-2).

That he counted the cost before committing himself to this expression of opinion is shown by his recognition that it was 'to the disadvantage of both' that 'the Bishops of France' had deemed it necessary 'to obtain the emancipation of the future clergy from the University of France' (p. 201).

It is probable that Dr. Pusey under-estimated the extent to which a religious influence might by determined effort be exercised in a secularized University; he was certainly right in believing that some provision ought to be made for the continued presence of Church teachers.

The foundation of Keble College was due in the first instance to the strong sense that there should be a great memorial to the author of the *Christian Year*. The particular form which the memorial took was largely the result of the circumstances of the time.

'It seemed most appropriate,' we are told, 'that the memorial to Keble should aim at securing for the Church a firmer foothold in the University at the moment when it was contemplated to secularize in great measure the endowments of the older Colleges' (p. 203).

The objects aimed at were described by Dr. Pusey in 'a very impressive speech' at a 'great meeting' in 'the Sheldonian Theatre,' which 'publicly inaugurated the undertaking' 'on St. Mark's Day,' '1868,' 'the anniversary of Keble's birthday,' when 'the first stone' of the new College 'was laid by the Archbishop of Canterbury' (p. 203); and when in the following year, in consequence of the persistent refusal of Dr. Liddon to accept the office of Warden, the present Bishop of Rochester was nominated to that post, Dr. Pusey 'warmly welcomed the appointment, and again renewed his intense interest in every detail of the preparations for the opening of the College' (p. 205).

From the foundation of the College until 1879 Dr. Pusey

remain
in that
resigna
place r
Halifa
the con

'Me
training
the han
College
Keble,
the sou
vidence
should
Council
unfriend
should
Christ
and tha

We
count
say of
reserve
Dr. Li
his frie
who c
He wil

A
Church
gian.
traordi
remark
the pe
Englan
to him
showed
cities w
profoun
to teach
Univer
His pa
reveale
voice o
tion on
or of th

remained a member of the Council. In writing to the Warden in that year to explain that his bodily infirmities rendered his resignation desirable, he expressed an earnest wish that his place might be taken by the Hon. C. L. Wood (now Viscount Halifax), and explained the importance which he attached to the composition of such a body.

'Members of Council affect very indirectly the character of the training of the young men, which is, by the Charter, wholly lodged in the hands of the Warden. Still, the only pledge of the fidelity of the College, as a foundation, to the teaching which characterized John Keble, and which is stamped by the Charter on the College, lies in the soundness of the Council. Higher duties might by God's Providence be imposed on you. The character of the successor who should carry on the lamp of truth would depend upon the then Council. If a majority of members of the Council should once be unfriendly or even indifferent to the claims of Catholic truth, or should make the office of Keble College to train good soldiers of Christ Jesus subordinate to Academic distinction, all would be lost, and that irretrievably' (p. 325).

We have referred already to Dr. Liddon's touching account of Dr. Pusey's last illness and death. We need only say of it that its great skill, its tender feeling, its reverent reserve are worthy of the mind to which it is due. And in Dr. Liddon's diary there is an entry, made when he heard of his friend's death, which contains an impressive lesson. 'He who created and trained Dr. Pusey can train successors if He will' (p. 386).

A great responsibility rests upon the members of the Church to which God gave this great saint and theologian. He was raised up to do a special work. His extraordinary intellectual gifts, his high moral qualities, his remarkable learning were unselfishly and unsparingly used for the performance of that great task. What the Church of England and the cause of religion generally in England owe to him it is utterly beyond our power to tell. But at least he showed that it was possible to unite the most wonderful capacities with the deepest personal humility, to join the most profound learning with a simple, childlike belief in God, and to teach and practise the complete faith and system of the Universal Church within the limits of the Church of England. His patience and reverence, his spirit of deep submission to revealed truth, his intense loyalty to Holy Scripture and the voice of the Holy Spirit within the Church confer an obligation on those who have gained some knowledge of his teaching or of the facts of his life, still more on those who through him,

directly or indirectly, have learned what Christianity and personal religion mean. It is an obligation on the student to thoroughness, on the thinker to depth and reality, on the statesman to a mind ever fixed on the glory of God and the good of souls. To have known of his life is to have been called to a higher level of thought, of work, of conduct. It is for the students and workers of the Church of England to see that they maintain and extend the victories which he won.

ART. III.—ST. PAUL OR MR. BARING-GOULD?

A Study of St. Paul: his Character and Opinions. By S. BARING-GOULD, M.A., author of 'The Tragedy of the Cæsars,' 'Mehalah,' &c. (London, 1897.)

THE name of Mr. Baring-Gould has long been before the world as that of a voluminous and varied author. The list of his published works occupies nearly a column in that most invaluable of clergy lists, *Crockford's Clerical Directory*, and we learn from it that it is now more than forty years since his first book appeared. Subjects of deepest spiritual import—the origin and development of religious belief, the mystery of suffering, the history of the Holy Eucharist in the first three centuries, the Nativity and the Passion and the Resurrection of our Blessed Lord; helps for clergy of less ability or more limited leisure, such as sermon sketches for extempore preachers, village sermons in ample measure, and sermons to children; stores gathered from excursions into by-paths through unfrequented fields, of weird-wolves and curious myths, of historic oddities and mediæval legends, of lost and hostile Gospels and curious survivals; works of history and travel, Germany and Iceland and the land of the troubadours—even so miscellaneous a list as this does not exhaust Mr. Baring-Gould's encyclopædic labours. To more than a round dozen of novels we may still add lucubrations on such trifles as modern difficulties and secular and religious education without exhausting the catalogue. With the great majority of these effusions we must confess we are entirely unacquainted—the world knows little of its greatest men—but, with so prodigious a range of acquirement as Mr. Baring-Gould's titles suggest, we are justified in the loftiest expectations when in all the ripeness of his matured thought he presents us with a study of St. Paul. We naturally anticipate

valuable
folding,
commen
he triu
the pr
to eve
we ma
should
theme
Ye
Mr. B
St. Pa
Apostl
and se
convic
Marten
ness w
authori
the wri
not see
him.'
that th
cheque
of a rea
Shakes
never w
desirou
holds t
standpo
nature,
stated,
Gould d
wealth
the trea
longed
least th
We
Baring-
most eg
with con
more im
the pres
which m
reaching
criticism
VOL.

valuable insight into inner life and deepest thought, some unfolding of the doubts and difficulties by which 'the great and commanding intellect' of St. Paul was beset, and over which he triumphed, some pregnant and helpful suggestions upon the problems which tried the early Church. It is not given to everyone to open up fine reaches of spiritual thought, but we may fairly expect that an expert and accomplished writer should justify by the result his selection of so magnificent a theme.

Yet from the very outset we confess to serious misgivings. Mr. Baring-Gould's title—the character and *opinions* of St. Paul—is somewhat jarring. The mainspring of the great Apostle's life—the solid foundation of his absolute self-sacrifice and self-surrender—was not his subjective opinions, but his conviction of positive dogmatic truth, 'positive' (as Bishop Martensen expresses it) 'not merely by virtue of the positiveness with which it is laid down, but also by virtue of the authority with which it is sealed.' Nor are we reassured by the writer's statement at the outset of his Preface that 'he did not seek to write this Life: it was, so to speak, forced upon him.' We have read like apologies with a shrewd suspicion that the compulsion was no stronger than the proffer of a cheque. Yet a grander subject could hardly occupy the pen of a ready writer. 'Paul,' as our author allows, 'Paul, like Shakespeare and Napoleon, *are* [*sic*] men of whom the world is never weary, who are ever in its mind, of whom it is always desirous to know more' (p. vii), and Mr. Baring-Gould rightly holds that there is room for another Life of him from the standpoint of one who will seek to sound the depths of human nature, and to probe the very heart of man. The ideal thus stated, worthy of so practised a psychologist as Mr. Baring-Gould claims to be, is one on which he might lavish all the wealth of illustration gathered from multifarious reading, all the treasures of spiritual philosophy acquired through prolonged study and handling of deep religious questions, and at least the grace and dignity of a finished literary style.

We may say at once that the reader who takes up Mr. Baring-Gould's *St. Paul* with any such expectations will be most egregiously disappointed. A fairly wide acquaintance with contemporary literature leads us to the conviction that a more irredeemably worthless volume has rarely issued from the press of a first-class publisher. The psychological study which might in adequate hands have opened out vistas of far-reaching thought exhausts itself in elaborate depreciatory criticism, and in imputations of mean and miserable motives.

The philosophical reflections and scientific illustrations scattered through the volume are as ludicrously jejune and puerile as any that would find place in a fourth form school-boy's essay. The writer deservedly incurs distrust by his repeated assertion of questionable particulars as if they were unquestioned and indisputable fact. Even grace of style and dignity of thought are lacking in this *Study*, which abounds in awkward expressions and is not free from a marked tinge of vulgarity. Worse than all, the entire volume is painfully deficient in that reverence of spirit in which we hold all criticism of the sacred Scriptures should be conducted—a fault which is not atoned for by the praise of St. Paul, which stands in strange juxtaposition with Mr. Baring-Gould's detraction. We are fully conscious of the gravity of this indictment, and of our own responsibility if we fail to prove the several counts we have included in it.

We begin with the minor blemishes of tone and style which are of more importance than is commonly realized. *Le style c'est l'homme même* expresses more than a truism of an author's manner, and may help to test his fitness to handle sacred themes. For such themes have power to impart a loftiness of thought which, even with the most uncultured writers, shines out from their unadorned and simple pages. Now Mr. Baring-Gould's book is pervaded throughout by what we can only describe as an atmosphere of intense literary vulgarity. He has no conception of the dignity of history, nor of the courtesy due to the illustrious dead or to living contemporaries. St. Luke did not wish, he tells us, to *stuff* his pages with certain details. The question whether St. Paul was married elicits the refined observation 'that he was not of so uxorious a nature as Peter, *who could go nowhere without his good woman at his side*' (p. 214). 'The character and opinions' of the great Apostle of the Gentiles are, in Mr. Baring-Gould's judgment, appropriately adorned by the information that 'if the widow and Paul were married, which is doubtful, they must have been an incongruous pair, she, thriving—and, like all Jewesses when youth is past, stout; he, frail, pallid, short of stature, with bandy legs, a long nose, and head already inclining to baldness' (p. 215). The Church, we learn, in Tertullian's day 'was well aware that unless some concessions were made she must be content to be the religion of a class, and that the class of the Have-nots and Know-nothings. It is, however, to be presumed that the rich and noble and intellectual have souls as well as the rag-tag' (p. 363). Even after such elegancies of diction we were

scarce
in ter
of cor
T
as is l
one w
The A
Proph
108).
were n
cogen
tender
and w
'Ther
of dut
362).
with th
have p
have n
graded
the wr
some o
Mr
his sen
Greek
to cour
times
annual
Phœbe
Roman
state of
tion, bu
to fath
reader's
Mr. Ba
does o
he rem
mysteri
We syn
as well
escapes
hardly
Paul 'w
from th
obfuscat

scarcely prepared to find the Dean of Canterbury referred to in terms like these, 'Here is the way in which that moulder of common opinion, Dean Farrar, scolds' (p. 259).

The recurrence of awkward phrases is a sign of such haste as is hardly permissible in the treatment of a grave subject by one who wields a practised pen. Here are a few examples. The Apostles 'had come to Christ by the Law and the Prophets. *It was like a ladder let down from heaven*' (p. 108). 'Some pagans had only coquetted with Judaism, others were more or less convinced *in its Monotheism and in the cogency of its divinely given Law*' (p. 120). 'The same tendencies were manifest in Rome as in Galatia and Achaia, *and which even stirred the converts in Macedonia*' (p. 299). 'There is hardly a sign in St. Paul's writings that any clash of duties had taken place or *was expected would take place*' (p. 362). 'As certainly as there have been these illumined souls with their revelation, so certain is it that this revelation they have preached has been beyond the comprehension of *all* who have received it, and that it has become corrupted and degraded by vulgar minds and heavy souls' (p. 320). Of course the writer means it has been beyond the comprehension of *some* of those who have professed to accept it.

Mr. Baring-Gould has an absurd fondness for interlarding his sentences with fine words which occasionally are only the Greek terms left untranslated to impress the reader or possibly to counterpoise the vulgar expressions in which he at other times indulges. Thus we read of 'the supreme joy of the annual commemoration of the *Anastasis*' (p. 240), and that Phœbe had the honour of carrying the Apostle's letter to the Romans, hidden in the folds of her *himation* (p. 246). 'The state of trance,' he tells us, 'is susceptible to divine illumination, but not *impetrating* it' (p. 132). After several attempts to fathom the meaning of this sentence, we abandon it to the reader's ingenuity, only observing that to 'impetrate,' outside Mr. Baring-Gould's pages, means to obtain by entreaty. Nor does our author phrase his difficulties very happily when he reminds us that *in* St. Paul there is the spiritual face—mysterious, inexplicable, but one with which we have to reckon. We sympathize with the man who has to *reckon with a face* as well as with the trial of having to allow *for a factor that escapes investigation* (p. 139). Such obscurity of diction is hardly atoned for by such slovenly expressions as that St. Paul 'would have liked the entire ripping away of the Church from the Synagogue' (p. 189), which some held 'to be obfuscated with Rabbinic error' (*ib.*) and that 'the Church of

Corinth was in a sort of jelly-fish condition' (p. 249). For unctuous expletives showered on the man who, living and dying, has probably done more for mankind and for his Master than any other through nineteen centuries Mr. Baring-Gould avows he has 'no stomach,' but this is possibly a misprint for heart or brain. We wonder whether such reverent students of the Epistles as Bishops Ellicott and Lightfoot are included in the writer's sweeping condemnation of those who fawn upon the Apostle and lay on adulation as with a trowel.

We have been startled in our perusal of this *Study* at the calm audacity which repeatedly states unproven theories and groundless surmises as if they were universally accepted facts. The degree of St. Paul's knowledge, or rather of his ignorance, of our Lord's birth, preaching, and miracles during his sojourn in Arabia; the extent of his acquaintance at the same period with the teaching of the Apostles (p. 93); the publication of the Book of Daniel during the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes (p. 97); the failure of St. Paul's mission to Cyprus, *proved by the silence* of St. Luke (p. 152); the despatch of the second Epistle to the Thessalonians from Berea *before* the first was sent from Corinth; the writing of a *third* letter to the Corinthians, very violent and stinging with all the sarcasms of which he was master—a letter regretted as soon as it was written and rigidly suppressed, since 'the Corinthian Church did not relish the exposure it made of its condition, *and the Apostle had no reason to be proud of it*' (p. 312): all these more or less doubtful circumstances are recorded without one qualifying word to show that they are at most only probable conjectures, or a single hint that some of them have been discussed and rejected by very competent authority. Amidst such assumptions we must, we presume, accept it on Mr. Baring-Gould's *ipse dixit* that Sergius Paulus did no more than 'express courteous acquiescence in what Paul had said. It agreed with his own views. It deepened his disgust for the obscenities of the worship of the Paphian Aphrodite, but it went no further' (p. 152). The silence of St. Luke on the subject shows that Sergius Paulus was not baptized, and that, so far the labours of St. Paul had been without result. Groundless as are many of these surmises, and dangerous as is the method of argument here employed, they appear almost venial beside the further trading on his imagination on which Mr. Baring-Gould ventures. Here are two examples. In Acts (xix. 11, 12) we read that God wrought miracles of no ordinary kind—*δυνάμεις οὐ τὰς τυχούσας*—by the hands of Paul, insomuch that unto the 'sick were carried away from his

body
them
direct
efficac
of G
narrat
and a

'T
once f
amule
Chald
had b
miracu
such p
efficaci

Of
troubl

'A
pronou
struck
Peter,
deliver

Of wh
tion w
senten
ascrib
flagran
means
sorrow

Th
prepar
almost
He is
ability
inferio
emanci
the R
essenti
to the
one ho
may ha
properl
Agripp
designe
detail

body handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them and the evil spirits went out.' Nothing can be more direct than the assertion here made of the speciality and efficacy of these miracles, and of their ascription to the power of God. Under Mr. Baring-Gould's manipulation the simple narrative is transformed into a remnant of pagan credulity and a result of uncertain effectiveness.

'The general run of people,' he writes, 'are not to be drawn at once from their superstitions, and, for a moment losing faith in the amulets supplied from the temple, and the charms distributed by the Chaldees, the Ephesians snatched at kerchiefs and loin-cloths that had been used by Paul, in the belief that they were endowed with miraculous powers. *We are not told that Paul himself countenanced such proceedings, but that in certain cases they were believed to be efficacious*' (pp. 297-8).

Our second instance is taken from the history of the troubles at Corinth:

'As to the incestuous Corinthian,' says Mr. Baring-Gould, 'Paul pronounced his sentence *hoping and expecting that*, as God had struck down Ananias and Sapphira when excommunicated by St. Peter, He would in like manner *suddenly slay the man* whom he delivered over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh' (pp. 311-12).

Of what St. Paul hoped or expected we have no intimation whatever in his specially solemn utterance of this terrible sentence, which is absolutely devoid of the vindictiveness ascribed to it. What his tenderness was towards even so flagrant an offender appears in his after anxiety 'lest by any means such a one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow' (2 Cor. ii. 7).

These glimpses into the work before us may perhaps have prepared the reader for Mr. Baring-Gould's persistent, we had almost said, malignant depreciation of the subject of his *Study*. He is never weary of disparaging the intellect, the logical ability, the temper, and the success of him who was not inferior to the very chiefest of the Apostles. St. Paul never emancipated himself, according to Mr. Baring-Gould, from the Rabbinic method of reasoning (p. 56). His mind was *essentially* narrow and one-sided. He swung from one pole to the other in his convictions, but he never saw more than one horizon at a time, never allowed gradations (p. 59). He may have obtained an inkling of Platonism, but it was never properly assimilated (p. 61). His oratorical effort before Agrippa was like a coloured advertisement on a hoarding, designed to arrest attention, without care about accuracy of detail (p. 83). Unfinished sentences, daring admissions,

Rabbinic subtleties, half-thought-out arguments, biting sneers, violent apostrophes, original ideas—all are whirled along on the waves, jostling each other, the significance of each lost in the irresistibility of the current which hurries them down; but when he got off the familiar ground of Old Testament prophecies, and where he could not quote texts, when he was not battling against Judaistic tendencies in his converts, he was hopelessly at sea (148). We shall find presently that in Mr. Baring-Gould's judgment St. Paul was no less at sea when he did quote texts; but we continue our selection of *flores*. St. Paul was of an excitable nature, irritable under opposition, and incapacitated by his Rabbinic education for thinking clearly (p. 263); he could not even make the best of his own argument, which in more skilful hands—say those of Mr. Baring-Gould—would have been very telling at the time (p. 271). Had he been put through a course of Euclid as a boy he would have argued in a different manner, and not so as to be unintelligible or inconclusive (p. 275). His arguments were to the Greeks so marvellous and incomprehensible that *they were disposed to regard them with the superstitious respect they paid to epilepsy!* (p. 324). No man was a more thorough-going literalist than Paul. With him the letter was everything; the spirit that indited it did not concern him (p. 328); this of the man who wrote 'not of the letter but of the spirit; for the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life' (2 Cor. iii. 6). 'Unquestionably Paul would have liked to convert the heathen, but he could not do it; he had not the faculty. He proposed it more than once, but there it all ended' (p. 418).

It would appear from these brief extracts, and from more elaborate arguments to which we shall return, that Mr. Baring-Gould's psychological studies have not engendered in him a very charitable estimate of human motives. To sound the depths of coarse natures and to develop the growth of fierce and ill-regulated passions are hardly the suitable training-ground for insight into the very heart of such men as St. Luke and Timothy, St. Stephen and St. Paul. In Mr. Baring-Gould's excessive anxiety to remind us that the saints of the Apostolic Church were men of like passions with ourselves, he portrays them one after another in the most unattractive colours. Luke and Timothy are depicted as poor creatures, without any will of their own, abjectly submissive to St. Paul's overbearing imperiousness, which would not brook the smallest contradiction. The angelic face, the dying intercession, the Divine vision, the sweet sleep of the protomartyr

have
quali

'T
wound
moved
of the
with a
of the
The A
spoke
opprob

W
proach
to con

'T
Gould,
faction
educati
would
and the
light, h
place i
differen
(p. 78)

Is
recall
Pharis
empha
defenc
true e
that th
ception
tion in
that th
unmeri
burnin
themse

It
Baring
and fro
out his
—of b
that co
the int
Baring

have no power to check the flow of Mr. Baring-Gould's unqualified disapproval—

'The defence of Stephen was no defence at all, but a series of wounding stabs. But this was not all. Regardless of his own safety, moved by his passionate indignation and *desire to insult* these doctors of the Law and rulers of the Temple, he burst forth. . . . Peter, with all his impetuosity, had never dashed such outrages in the face of the elders of Israel. He had sought to win, not to exasperate. *The Acts show us that Stephen was a man without self-control. He spoke truths in the most rasping manner, and couched in the most opprobrious terms*' (p. 77).

We apologize to our readers for reproducing such reproaches heaped upon a sacred head; but there is worse yet to come:

'*To certain tempers, where there is no breeding,*' writes Mr. Baring-Gould, '*the opportunity of saying offensive things gives positive satisfaction, rendered acute if those addressed be superiors in position and educational endowment. It was, apparently, so with Stephen. It would seem as though his conversion had been of the intellect only, and that till the vision was vouchsafed him of Jesus in the ineffable light, his heart had been untouched. Then a moral revulsion took place in his nature, and, falling on his knees, he prayed in a very different temper from that in which he had addressed the Sanhedrim*' (p. 78).

Is it necessary in reply to these offensive comments to recall our Blessed Lord's denunciations of the scribes and Pharisees? Is it seemly so to speak of one who is declared emphatically in the sacred page, both before and after his defence, to have been a man full of the Holy Ghost? Is it true even on the lower ground of psychological reasoning that the scathing rebuke to which Mr. Baring-Gould takes exception can only indicate fierceness of temper and a satisfaction in uttering opprobrious words? Is it not rather the fact that the gentlest natures, when deeply moved by the sense of unmerited wrong done to others, express their displeasure in burning and indignant words, which no wrong inflicted on themselves could have extorted from them?

It is in a like spirit of persistent detraction that Mr. Baring-Gould portrays the great Apostle of the Gentiles, and from the standpoint of an intolerable assumption metes out his puny measure—in each case almost equally ridiculous—of blame or praise. 'Paul,' he tells us, 'was not quite all that could have been desired, for he was out of touch with the intellectual life of the classic world' (p. 23). Has Mr. Baring-Gould never seen Bishop Lightfoot's striking essay on

St. Paul and Seneca? If not, he is not adequately furnished for his task. If he has, comment on the above sentence is superfluous. Paul 'had obtained an inkling of Platonism, but it was never properly assimilated' (p. 61). He rambles from the point so much that for nearly two thousand years it has been impossible to unravel his meaning (p. 146). He did not originate Gnosticism. It existed as a philosophic and theologic system before he was born, but its teachers took hold of the handle he incautiously offered them (p. 274). He denounced the Law in vague terms which might mean anything or nothing, and had in consequence thrown men's minds into such confusion as would have arisen if the French National Convention in 1792 had abolished all existing weights and measures without instituting any new standards. Into much such a state of mind were the Galatians cast by the tirades of Paul against the Law (p. 305). The worth of these appreciations may be judged by the references with which the assertion is supported that 'in a hesitating manner Paul had claimed possession of the gift of prophecy, but he must soon have lost confidence in his prophetic power' (p. 422)—a footnote refers us to 1 Cor. xiii. 9, Rom. xii. 6. The first of these passages tells us that in our present condition we only know in part and prophesy in part. The second enjoins that he who prophesies (or preaches) should prophesy according to the proportion of faith. Was a more absurd non-sequitur ever deduced from given premises? As we turn away indignantly the stern warning of the late Poet Laureate spontaneously recurs to us with the change of a single word:

Vex not thou the prophet's mind
 With thy shallow wit;
 Vex not thou the prophet's mind:
 Thou canst not fathom it.

But perhaps the most painful and offensive blemish in this *Study* is its repeated insinuation of untruthfulness, at one time softened by some palliative epithet, at another veiled under the imputation of invincible Rabbinic inaccuracy. At first we are told 'the Apostles obviously did not altogether trust Paul's account of his vision seen at Antioch. They thought he had *unwittingly* coloured it to suit his own views' (pp. 121, 122). This theory is based on a strange misapplication to the Twelve instead of to the unbelieving Jews of our Lord's warning to St. Paul in the Temple.¹ Next we are told, 'if Paul's description before Agrippa of what he had heard at his

¹ Acts xxii. 18.

conv
 he p
 and
 lated
 serve
 conc
 nate
 and
 writ
 distin
 a dia
 ment
 tures

'
 lxviii.
 Paul
 on hi
 this t
 proce
 proph
 scribe
 ascen
 and o
 The
 differ
 deter
 nothi
 tion c

'
 but, r
 Holy
 tion, a
 but sin
 refere
 This
 and s
 gestive

A
 objec
 from
 sation
 mutu
 Gould
 which

conversion be correctly given by Luke, then it must be allowed he possessed a faculty of giving these matters a partial aspect, and of *embroidering them to suit his purpose*, which is calculated, if not to awaken suspicion, at least to call forth reserve' (*ib.*). The effect of inspiration is discussed, and the conclusion is reached that 'we are *almost* bound to discriminate between Paul as an inspired Apostle and as a disputant,' and with his accustomed easy confidence Mr. Baring-Gould writes, 'his Hellenic proselytes were *certainly* able to draw a distinction between Paul as an inspired Apostle and Paul as a dialectician.' But inspiration, in Mr. Baring-Gould's judgment, did not prevent St. Paul from falsifying the Scriptures:

'In the Epistle to the Ephesians (iv. 8), when quoting Psalm lxviii. 18,' he writes, '*because the original would not serve his purpose, Paul altered it to suit.* "Wherefore he saith, When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men." On this text he shows that Christ is the giver of grace to men; and he proceeds to enumerate the gifts conferred in accordance with the prophecy. But David had said nothing of the kind; he had described Jehovah as a victorious monarch returning from battle and ascending to Zion, receiving on His triumphal march the homage and oblations of all men, even of His enemies' (p. 327).

The passage is one of acknowledged difficulty, has been differently estimated and explained, and is not to be abruptly determined by any man's dogmatic assertion that *David said nothing of the kind*. Contrast with this the reverent explanation of so ripe a scholar as Bishop Ellicott:

'We admit,' he writes, 'frankly and freely the verbal difference, but, remembering that the Apostle wrote under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, we recognize here neither imperfect memory, precipitation, arbitrary change, accommodation, nor Rabbinical interpretation, but simply the *fact* that the Psalm, especially v. 18, *had* a Messianic reference, and bore within a further, fuller, and deeper meaning. This meaning the inspired Apostle, by a slight change of language, and substitution of *ἔδωκε* for the more dubious *ἔλεη*, succinctly, suggestively, and *authoritatively* unfolds.'¹

A conclusive answer could equally be made to the other objections brought against St. Paul's method of quotation from the Old Testament, as well as to the long-drawn accusation of his incompetence to expound satisfactorily the mutual relation of the Law and the Gospel. Mr. Baring-Gould devotes two chapters to this subject, the outcome of which is to justify those who allege the authority of St. Paul for

¹ *Epistle to the Ephesians*, 3rd ed. p. 83 n.

disregard of the moral law. He even dares to write that St. Paul 'did not know how to disengage the ceremonial law from the moral law. . . . He beat about for arguments and caught at the most inconclusive, because he failed to perceive the very simple and elementary reason for distinguishing them that lay under his eyes' (p. 270). Mr. Baring-Gould, however, kindly remedies the Apostle's shortcomings, and tells us *what should have been Paul's response* (p. 268).

Mr. Baring-Gould's account of St. Paul's stay at Corinth, which forms the subject matter of Chapter XIII., well affords a typical example of his method and spirit. 'From Athens' (he tells us) 'Paul went *precipitately* [!] to Corinth. It was like going from Cambridge to Newmarket, but it was more than Newmarket, it was Chicago and Newmarket in one, a great mercantile centre, and a place for jockeys and athletes; it was more, it was a Paris also, the seat of every description of profligacy' (p. 241). We can only deprecate in passing the invidious selection of the French capital for imputations to which London or Vienna or Berlin are alas! no less liable. We must omit a tempting paragraph which describes the city during the Isthmian games, 'its streets resonant with the twanging of strings and the twittering of pipes and the screaming of singers running up and down the chromatic scales'—the most uncouth effort at realism perhaps ever attempted—but well in keeping with the scene in the squares, where mountebanks exhibited, amongst them a man who '*swallowed* [*sic*] the head of a pike and made a little boy twirl on tip-toe at the other end of the shaft' (p. 243). We learn that in the synagogue at Corinth Paul was on familiar ground, 'he could go over his old arguments, quote the same much-used prophecies. . . . He had done with the method ventured on to the Greeks at Athens. "Brethren, when I came to you, I came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom (as I did at Athens)"' and on the strength (we presume) of this audacious groundless interpolation the writer adds, 'The first epistle to the Corinthians was not written till two or three years later, and yet it is clear that the dismal failure at Athens still rankled in his heart. The epistle abounds in thrusts and gibes at secular wisdom' (p. 244).

When some measure of success had been obtained, 'the heads of the Ghetto at Corinth, rich merchants and money-lenders, began to bestir themselves, and he found himself excluded from the synagogues. *Thereupon he pursued a course vastly aggravating.* He shook his raiment and said to them, "Your blood be upon your own heads: I am clean." We regret

that M
Rams
obedi
learn
contro
accept
admit
adulte
drunk
he had
Mr. B
Christ
steep
the cl
Church
of ind
discip

'T
togeth
was at
vert to
does n
these v
new se
at thei
more
charity
ment'

It
with t
misint
sweep
world
He re
knew
Gospe
says t
but y
fallibl
disapp
record
missio
Paul
thems
Baring

that Mr. Baring-Gould can quote the support of Professor Ramsay in thus describing action which was in literal obedience to the directions of our Blessed Lord ; but we soon learn that St. Paul's prudence was as defective as his self-control. 'In his single-minded enthusiasm and readiness to accept any one who professed conviction, Paul seems to have admitted some of the very scum of the city—fornicators; adulterers, effeminate, those guilty of unnatural crimes, thieves, drunkards, extortioners, revilers—to discover afterwards that he had been too precipitate' (p. 246). 'He may have doubted,' Mr. Baring-Gould adds, 'whether all this rabble of professing Christians, with their ugly past and hardly abated passions, steeped in dissolute habits, could be got into shape' (*ib.*). At the close of the chapter, the innuendo of rash admission to the Church is renewed with the added indictment of gross neglect of indispensable Church organization for the government and discipline of such immature converts.

'The accumulation of street sweepings was too newly raked together to manifest its nature in the short period during which Paul was at Corinth. . . . No missionary nowadays would admit a convert to full Christian privileges till he had his sincerity tested. Paul does not seem to have allowed of gradations in goodness, and when these worn-out sensualists accepted the Gospel, being in quest of a new sensation, or under the depression caused by temporary disgust at their past, he took them into the Church, just as they were, and, more astonishing still, left them to themselves. His overflowing charity and single-minded faith were destined to bitter disillusionment' (p. 256).

It would require more space than we can spare to deal with this farrago of misapprehension, misrepresentation, and misinterpretation. St. Paul had to face a world of street sweepings, as Mr. Baring-Gould scornfully terms them—a world of men dead in trespasses and sins—and he knew it. He realized to the full the heavy odds against him, but he knew that it was at once the test and the triumph of the Gospel that it could save 'the street sweepings.' 'Such,' he says to the Corinthians, 'were some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified.' He was not infallible in discernment of spirit, and he suffered the bitter disappointment inseparable from missionary work, the record of which in Holy Writ has kept many a sore-tried missionary in after centuries from utter despair. That St. Paul accepted converts heedlessly and then left them to themselves has no warrant beyond the *ipse dixit* of Mr. Baring-Gould, who argues here, in his usual heedless fashion,

from the silence of the New Testament about the organization of the Corinthian Church.

It is strange that Mr. Baring-Gould should indulge in such reproaches since he enlarges with profuse illustration from natural science upon the gradual development of the Church as a living organism. 'In an early condition of life,' he observes truly enough, 'the members are not developed, nor are their functions determined,' and he follows up this assertion with an elaborate description of the *amœba*, 'a transparent lump, which has no parts, absorbs food through its pores' (is it all pores then, or are pores not parts?), 'but has no particular stomach, nor any brain. It assimilates its food in the lump that thinks in a rudimentary fashion, &c. It was so, though not in so extreme a fashion, with early Christianity. It was, if we may employ the expression, in its grub condition' (pp. 250-1). The elaborate description of the simile and its immediate disavowal as too extreme are both exquisitely ludicrous. Hardly less ridiculous is a paragraph which tells us that 'by pulling off the wings of a butterfly, plucking out its antennæ, shearing its legs to stumps, the insect may be reduced to something more or less like the caterpillar out of which it sprang, but at the expense of everything that makes life precious and beautiful' (p. 255). If in observing insect life Mr. Baring-Gould is acute, in studying mankind he becomes profound. 'In every collection of men, in a Parish Council, on a School Board, everywhere, some will be for new experiments and others will cling to precedent' (p. 301).

We are not, however, so impressed as we might have been by the depth and originality of these remarks, as Mr. Baring-Gould had considerably forewarned us that he was gifted with growing powers of mind. He can even remember the days, *when young*, in which he could not master Euler's proof of the Binomial Theorem, and its difficulty affected him painfully—'it was to me as though I were striking my head against a stone wall'! Nor does he profess to stand alone. 'This,' he adds, 'is what takes place in all minds, a gradual enlargement of scope and acquisition of power to see more than was seen yesterday. There is but one law applicable to things spiritual as to things mental' (pp. 109, 110). Here we reach a generalization of the highest order applicable to the entire universe, and logically deduced from the youthful experience of the microcosm Mr. Baring-Gould. Of one axiom at least of his mental philosophy Mr. Baring-Gould supplies an immediate example. The reader of the next sentence, '*With the Apostles*, however, there was set *them* no

comp
seen
envy
tical

It
our s
portio
anxie
with
the w
the m
any fi
Paul
missiv
gracio
most
Christ
penne
which
is rep
repud
Church

'H
impatie
point:
tatters
convinc
proving
Church
through
Judaic

So ena
on the

'He
doctrin
greedin
confoun
sullied
scandal
consciou

Again
ever pe
measur
Apostl
own p

complicated problem to solve,' will readily allow that he has seen more than was seen yesterday, and will be disposed to envy those who have been spared so complicated a grammatical puzzle.

It is difficult to realize, without longer quotations than our space will allow, the entire lack of a sense of due proportion which is displayed throughout this *Study*. In his anxiety to prove that St. Paul was a man of like passions with ourselves, the writer lets slip no opportunity of putting the worst construction on his actions, of attributing to him the most unworthy motives, of exaggerating to the utmost any frank avowal of failure or of human infirmity. If St. Paul praises any, it is only because they are slavishly submissive to his imperious will. '*He gives the Romans all the gracious appellations which he lavishes usually on only his most docile adherents*. They are "called to be saints," "called in Christ Jesus"' (p. 346). Was a more unworthy insinuation ever penned? A score of like passages might be adduced in which the noble heart, whose self-sacrifice was so absolute, is represented as embittered by selfish mortification at the repudiation of his authority, as well as by the scandals of the Church at Corinth. We are told:

'He took both to heart intensely. His excitable character, his impatience, his intolerance of opposition were wrought to fever point: and the manner in which some of his arguments were torn to tatters before his face, and his inability to supply anything sounder, convinced as he was of the soundness of his theories, but incapable of proving them, must have terribly discouraged him. His model Churches either stank in the nostrils of the not over nice pagans, through their immoralities, or backed out of Antinomism into Judaic observance' (p. 316).

So enamoured is the author of this picture that he repeats it on the next page in yet more glaring colours.

'He could not make his scheme of salvation intelligible . . . his doctrine had been made a handle for "working all uncleanness with greediness." His Churches, *which were to astonish the world and confound that at Jerusalem*, were wavering in faith, torn by jealousies, sullied by immoralities, hotbeds of strife, of insolence and of scandal. . . . His reasonings convinced nobody, and *he was himself conscious at last how poor and ineffective they were*' (p. 317).

Again we ask, was a grosser travesty of a writer's meaning ever penned? Heart-breaking trial, sorrow almost without measure, there was doubtless—but no misgiving in the Apostle's mind either as to the power of the Gospel or as to his own presentation of it. To the two Churches which caused

him most anxiety he writes in words that betray no such consciousness. 'Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed!'¹ 'I, brethren, when I came unto you, came not with excellency of speech or of man's wisdom . . . that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.'²

The reader will probably have by this time sufficient insight into Mr. Baring-Gould's estimate of the writings which occupy a full half of the New Testament. Yet we beg space for a longer paragraph in order that we may demonstrate beyond all question that we have done the author of this *Study* no injustice in our representation of his views. With lofty superiority, not unmingled, we imagine, with compassion, Mr. Baring-Gould exposes the utter unfitness of the 'chosen vessel' for the work to which God had called him.

'Paul,' he writes, 'was not qualified to succeed as a preacher to the heathen. He could speak Greek passably, but his pronunciation, and his Hebraistic turns, his occasional lapses into bad grammar, were such as to subject him to ridicule among the highly cultured and such as were accustomed to listen to the orators in the Forum and the Porch. Those who heard him, from among the cultured, shrugged their shoulders, and said, "His bodily presence is weak and his speech contemptible." In his writings he was guilty of many solecisms. He confounded the tenses, putting the pluperfect for the præterite, the præterite for the present, the infinitive for the imperative; now one case is employed in place of another, then the substantive is taken in place of the adjective; now he makes an irregular use of the particles that serve to tie together the parts of his discourse, taking them in their Hebrew signification, making such confusion in his sense that the antecedent seems to be the consequent, and conclusions take the place of premises. He rambles from his point in an argument, is easily led away from his thread of reasoning upon a side issue, and it is sometimes very difficult to understand his drift. Now if this is so in a letter that has been carefully revised, what must it have been in his extempore discourses' (pp. 145-6).

Now we venture to inquire, at the close of this long catalogue of St. Paul's imputed deficiencies, how far Mr. Baring-Gould is qualified to pronounce so elaborate a condemnation. Has he acquired such a mastery over the extremely difficult structure of Hellenistic Greek as to authorize his utterance of an *ex cathedra* judgment upon all and several of the points embraced in this sweeping criticism; and if not, what moral right has he to mislead the general reader by pretensions to

¹ Galatians i. 8.

² I Cor. ii. 1, 5.

advan
deepe
men
devot
his E
Mr. B
ledge
any o
Mr. B
would
far les
of par
infini
Attic
in his
ductio
ing.
line, th
and hi
tingui
is con
foolish
tion (i
of the
the ex
How p
recall
comm
are tol
letters
and un
our pr
should
censur
tread.

Th
altoget
blame
it. H
the bo
he neg

¹ See

advanced scholarship which are wholly baseless? Far deeper students of St. Paul's writings than Mr. Baring-Gould, men of richer learning and deeper thought, men who have devoted a lifetime to the critical and grammatical study of his Epistles—find in that study not the blemishes on which Mr. Baring-Gould loves to dilate, but 'the reward of a real knowledge of the mind of the original which cannot be acquired in any other way.'¹ There is no evidence in the book before us that Mr. Baring-Gould has any of the technical scholarship which would fit him to criticize any Greek grammatical construction, far less to dogmatize on that most obscure question, the use of particles in the Hellenistic dialect, whilst the use of the infinitive for the imperative to which he refers is found both in Attic prose and in Epic poetry. We see no proof of such learning in his *réchauffé* of strictures long since refuted, and his reproduction of second-hand invective, mostly spoiled in the borrowing. Of course Mr. Baring-Gould can and does urge that one line, that St. Paul's opponents called his bodily presence weak and his speech contemptible; but has he no power to distinguish between what was contemptible in their eyes and what is contemptible of a truth; no discrimination between 'the foolishness of preaching' and foolish preaching; no recollection (in his eagerness to decry St. Paul's method of teaching) of the Apostle's express disclaimer of human wisdom, that the excellency of the power might be of God and not of man? How passing strange, too, is the lapse of memory which can recall the single line of adverse criticism and disregard the commendation which immediately precedes it. 'His letters,' we are told in the same breath, 'are weighty and powerful;' his letters, says Mr. Baring-Gould, are illogical, ungrammatical, and unintelligible. The most elementary acquaintance with our present knowledge of the dialect of the New Testament should have warned the writer against the immodesty of his censure; but Baring-Goulds rush in where scholars fear to tread.

The truth is that Mr. Baring-Gould has attempted a task altogether beyond his powers, and he has only himself to blame for flagrant exposure of his incompetence to deal with it. He has forgotten that it is not everyone that can bend the bow of Ulysses, and in his hurried fashion of bookmaking he neglects the well-worn caution:

'Sumite materiam vestris, qui scribitis, æquam
Viribus: et versate diu quid ferre recusent,
Quid valeant humeri.'

¹ See Bishop Ellicott's *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Preface, p. ix.

For the true psychologist, for the man of adequate spiritual insight, of warm heart and clear brain, no more magnificent subject of study could well be found than the mind and character of St. Paul, but Mr. Baring-Gould assuredly, despite his claim to the pursuit of psychology, is not that man. He is able, we freely allow, to draw a powerful picture of such coarse characters as make *Mehalah* a telling story, and he can use the scissors and paste effectively in stringing together historic oddities and mediæval myths. In his romances he may find a suitable place for the sham philosophy which, since Bulwer Lytton's days, has been one of the tricks of the trade in writing fiction, and for the pompous insistence on the obvious which is all his own. But such stage properties become alike offensive and ridiculous when introduced, as Mr. Baring-Gould employs them, in the discussion of the sacred writings and of one of their foremost authors. Had this *Study* been the work of an avowed sceptic we should have passed it over and left it to the obscurity which it merits; we only notice it because it proceeds from a well-known hand. That a priest of the English Church should have issued a book on such a theme so flippant and so likely to injure incautious readers we most deeply regret. The rash handling of Scripture is too prevalent a habit, against which we shall ever utter our persistent protest, nor will any book be welcomed in these pages which does not breathe the spirit of the Psalmist's utterance:

'My heart standeth in awe of Thy Word.'

ART. IV.—HORT'S 'CHRISTIAN ECCLESIA.'

The Christian Ecclesia. A Course of Lectures on the Early History and Early Conceptions of the Ecclesia and Four Sermons. By FENTON JOHN ANTHONY HORT, D.D., Lady Margaret's Reader in Divinity in the University of Cambridge. (London, 1897.)

THIS volume contains the lectures delivered by Dr. Hort in the Michaelmas Terms of 1888 and 1889. In them the gifted and learned author had under consideration the evidence which the New Testament supplies on the early history and organization of the Church. He chose the term 'Ecclesia' as being a 'perfectly colourless word,' the use of which made it possible to avoid the 'associations' connected with the term

'church'
degree
which
p. v)
subject

'the c
materi
Didac
Irenæ

and c
incom
in the

'the le
New
institu

It
by the
found
instan
a state
compa
to poi
'is der
the res
tuagint
ἐκκαλέ

He th

'Th
ἐκκλησι
the wo
Scriptu
"called
never s
gests th
Again,
from a
times,
of fact
simply
by the
Numb.
in the
this pri
simply

VOL.

'church' and the term 'congregation' alike, and 'in some degree to get behind words and names to the simple facts which they originally denoted' (pp. 1-2; compare preface, p. v). It had been Dr. Hort's intention to continue the subject by considering

'the chief ecclesiastical problems of the second century, with the material of this kind supplied by Clement of Rome and Hermas, the Didache of the Apostles, Ignatius and Polycarp, Justin Martyr and Irenæus (to name only the chief names)' (p. 224);

and consequently the present work is, from one point of view, incomplete. At the same time, as is pointed out by the editor in the preface, 'it is no mere fragment,' since

'the lectures as they stand practically exhaust the evidence of the New Testament, at least as far as the early history of Christian institutions is concerned' (p. vi).

It is scarcely necessary to say that this work is marked by the careful and accurate scholarship which may always be found in anything from the pen of Dr. Hort. There is an instance in the opening lecture on 'the word Ecclesia.' From a statement on the use of *ἐκκλησία* in the Septuagint and a comparison of the Hebrew words *קָהָל* and *עֵדָה* Dr. Hort is led to point out that *קָהָל*

'is derived from an obsolete root meaning to call or summon, and the resemblance to the Greek *καλέω* naturally suggested to the Septuagint translators the word *ἐκκλησία*, derived from *καλέω* (or rather *ἐκκαλέω*) in precisely the same sense' (p. 5).

He then states

'There is no foundation for the widely spread notion that *ἐκκλησία* means a people or a number of individual men *called out* of the world or mankind. In itself the idea is of course entirely Scriptural, and moreover it is associated with the word and idea "called," "calling," "call." But the compound verb *ἐκκαλέω* is never so used, and *ἐκκλησία* never occurs in a context which suggests this supposed sense to have been present to the writer's mind. Again, it would not have been unnatural if this sense of *calling out* from a larger body had been as it were put into the word in later times, when it had acquired religious associations. But as a matter of fact we do not find that it was so. The original *calling out* is simply the calling of the citizens of a Greek town out of their houses by the herald's trumpet to summon them to the assembly, and Numb. x. shows that the summons to the Jewish assembly was made in the same way. In the actual usage of both *qāhāl* and *ἐκκλησία* this primary idea of summoning is hardly to be felt. They mean simply an assembly of the people; and accordingly in the Revised

Version of the Old Testament "assembly" is the predominant rendering of *qāhāl*' (pp. 5-6).

Dr. Hort then passes on to the two passages in the Gospels in which the word *ἐκκλησία* occurs, and explains it as signifying in one instance¹ 'the Jewish community, apparently the Jewish local community, to which the injured person and the offender both belonged,' and in the other instance² not any 'partial or narrowly local Ecclesia,' but 'the congregation of God which held so conspicuous a place in the ancient Scriptures' (p. 10).

Appreciating very highly the care and accuracy and scholarship of this discussion, we are unable, for two reasons, to accept the interpretation of the word *ἐκκλησία* in St. Matthew xviii. 17 which Dr. Hort thus adopted. In the first place, our Lord had already in St. Matthew xvi. 18 used the word with a view to the future in the sense of the 'congregation of God' which He was to build—that is, the whole Christian 'Ecclesia.' It is natural that, speaking on a subsequent occasion of the laws of life by which His disciples were to be ruled, He should again intend the same sense as that which had been impressed in most solemn words at a most significant time. And, in the second place, the context of the passage does not appear to be compatible with *ἐκκλησία* denoting the 'Jewish local community.' Our Lord is laying down principles and methods of action which are to be observed by His disciples; and He goes on to say in words which immediately follow, with evident reference to the powers which are to be lodged in the Christian 'Ecclesia,' 'Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven,' and to promise, not only the accomplishment of that which two disciples shall agree to ask, but also His special presence 'where two or three are gathered together in' His 'Name.'³

A subject of very great interest discussed in the early part of the book is the position of the Twelve during the ministry of our Lord. Dr. Hort points out that the term 'Apostles' is rarely applied to them in the Gospels. St. Matthew only uses it in introducing the list of the Twelve, 'Now the names of the twelve Apostles are these.'⁴ By St. Mark, according to Westcott and Hort's text, the use of the name is ascribed to our Lord Himself in connexion with the appointment of the Twelve;⁵ and, according to all the texts, it is used by the

¹ St. Matt. xviii. 17.

² St. Matt. xvi. 18.

³ St. Matt. xviii. 18-20.

⁴ St. Matt. x. 2.

⁵ St. Mark iii. 14.

Evangelists
from Luke
Lord's
are s
preach
return
denies
uses
Lord's
is sent

D
the f
follow

'V
the te
of the
strictl
beginn
and B
with
Missio
apostl
spoke
as it w
sitting
indica
throug
It rem
the T
or "th
'A

ship,
of the
always
Him
Mark,
in form
to wor
those
up wi
record
possib

It

1

4

6

Evangelist to describe the Twelve in recording their return from the mission on which they were sent by Him.¹ In St. Luke's Gospel the word is of more frequent occurrence. Our Lord is said to have used it on choosing the Twelve;² they are so called, according to some MSS., when sent out to preach and heal,³ and, according to all authorities, on their return;⁴ putting aside the passage in xi. 49, they are incidentally so described in three other places.⁵ St. John never uses the word except in its general sense in the saying of our Lord 'A servant is not greater than his lord; neither one that is sent (*ἀπόστολος*) greater than he that sent him.'⁶

Dr. Hort's inference from these facts and from the use of the terms the 'Twelve' and the 'Disciples' is stated as follows:

'We are led, I think, to the conclusion that in its original sense the term Apostle was not intended to describe the habitual relation of the Twelve to our Lord during the days of His ministry, but strictly speaking only that mission among the villages, of which the beginning and the end are recorded for us; just as in the Acts, Paul and Barnabas are called Apostles (*i.e.* of the Church of Antioch) with reference to that special mission which we call St. Paul's First Missionary Journey, and to that only. At the same time this limited apostleship was not heterogeneous from the apostleship of later days spoken of in the Acts, but a prelude to it, a preparation for it, and, as it were, a type of it. Such sayings as that difficult one⁷ about sitting on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel, are indications that a distinctive function was reserved for the Twelve throughout, over and above their function as the chiefest disciples. It remains true that the habitual, always appropriate, designations of the Twelve during our Lord's ministry were simply "the disciples" or "the twelve" or "the twelve disciples."

'And this use of names points to corresponding facts. Discipleship, not apostleship, was the primary active function, so to speak, of the Twelve till the Ascension, and, as we shall see, it remained always their fundamental function. The purpose of their being with Him (with the Lord) stands first in that memorable sentence of St. Mark, and is sharply distinguished from the Lord's second purpose in forming them into a body, viz. the sending them forth to preach and to work acts of deliverance. But the distinction does not rest on those words alone. A far larger proportion of the Gospels is taken up with records of facts belonging to the discipleship than with records of the facts belonging to the apostleship, so far as it is possible to distinguish them' (pp. 28-9).

It is in accordance with this position that Dr. Hort

¹ St. Mark vi. 30.

² St. Luke vi. 13.

³ St. Luke ix. 1.

⁴ St. Luke ix. 10.

⁵ St. Luke xvii. 5, xxii. 14, xxiv. 10.

⁶ St. John xiii. 16.

⁷ St. Matt. xix. 28; St. Luke xxii. 30.

regards the Twelve at the Last Supper as having been 'representatives of the Ecclesia at large,' 'disciples more than' 'Apostles' (p. 30); understands the five chapters of St. John's Gospel from the thirteenth to the seventeenth as treating the Twelve as the nucleus of the whole 'future Ecclesia' (p. 31); and declares that 'the whole Ecclesia shares alike in' the 'transmitted Mission' described in the words 'as Thou didst send me into the world, I also sent them into the world'¹ (p. 32). So too, of the utterances after the Resurrection recorded in St. Matthew xxviii. 16-20 and St. John xx. 19-23, he says

'Granting that it was probably to the Eleven that our Lord directly and principally spoke on both these occasions (and even to them alone when He spoke the words at the end of St. Matthew's Gospel), yet it still has to be considered in what capacity they were addressed by Him. If at the Last Supper, and during the discourses which followed, when the Twelve or Eleven were most completely secluded from all other disciples as well as from the unbelieving Jews, they represented the whole Ecclesia of the future, it is but natural to suppose that it was likewise as representatives of the whole Ecclesia of the future, whether associated with other disciples or not, that they had given to them those two assurances and charges of our Lord, about the receiving of the Holy Spirit and the remitting and retaining of sins (howsoever we understand these words), and about His universal authority in heaven and on earth, on the strength of which He bids them bring all the nations into discipleship, and assures them of His own presence with them all the days even to the consummation of the age' (pp. 33-4).

There is very much for which Dr. Hort thus contends with which we agree and which we think of high value. The Twelve were certainly trained and taught by our Lord as the nucleus of the whole Christian body; to them were delivered the truths and in them was developed the character which were to be the inheritance of Christians generally; their position as disciples is prominent throughout the Gospels. But Dr. Hort's view does not seem to us to satisfy a good deal of the evidence which the Gospels supply. It does not sufficiently allow for the marked distinction which there is between the Twelve and the other disciples;² it does not allow adequate weight to the fact that certainly St. Luke and, according to Westcott and Hort's text, St. Mark also expressly say that our Lord at the time of the appointment of

¹ St. John xvii. 18.

² See *e.g.*, St. Matt. x. 1, xxviii. 16; St. Mark iv. 10, x. 32; St. Luke vi. 13, xviii. 31; St. John vi. 66-7, 70.

the Twelve gave them the name of Apostles ;¹ the explanation of three passages in St. Luke's Gospel² as being an 'anticipation' of 'the title which' 'acquired a fresh currency after the Ascension' (p. 26) is unsatisfactory. Moreover, while the Twelve or Eleven at the Last Supper no doubt were from one point of view representatives of the whole Christian body, it must not be forgotten that they were specially chosen by our Lord to share in that from which other disciples, some of whom subsequent events showed to be faithful disciples, were excluded. If so, we have ground for thinking that there was a special reason for the charge at the end of St. Matthew's Gospel being given to the Eleven, and for finding a special significance in relation to them in the words, 'As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you;' 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.'³ And it follows that Dr. Hort's later statement, 'There is' 'no trace in Scripture of a formal commission of authority' to the Apostles 'for government from Christ Himself' (p. 84) must altogether be denied.

On critical grounds, then, we question the adequacy of Dr. Hort's view of the Twelve during the ministry of our Lord. Yet it is necessary to notice that this way of regarding them would not affect the theology of the Catholic Church. If it is true that all our Lord's treatment of them and promises to them regarded them as representatives not of the ministry but of all Christians, it would by no means follow that it was not part of our Lord's design that there should be among Christians those who by Divine power should be able to perform special functions. There is a true sense in which all that Catholic theology claims for the priesthood belongs to the whole Christian body. Christians generally are 'an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation.'⁴ They have received in Baptism and Confirmation the anointing of the Holy Spirit. Yet there are functions of the body which it can perform only by means of special organs. To take one instance, the Eucharistic offering is the act of the

¹ St. Mark iii. 14; St. Luke vi. 13.

² St. Luke xvii. 5, xxii. 14, xxiv. 10.

³ St. John xx. 21-3; Dr. Hort apparently allows that these words were spoken 'directly and principally' to the Eleven (p. 33). If it is correct that St. Luke xxiv. 33 shows that others than the ten were with them at the time of our Lord's appearance as well as when the two returned from Emmaus, St. John xx. 24-5 (*cf.* xxi. 1) seems to imply that there was a special meaning for the Eleven.

⁴ 1 St. Peter ii. 9.

whole Christian people. The plural number is continually used in the services of the Church. In the Liturgy of St. James, 'We offer unto Thee this awful and unbloody sacrifice';¹ the same words in that of the Syrian Jacobites;² 'We have placed before Thee of Thine own gifts and we pray and entreat Thee, send out from Thy holy place on high' 'the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit of truth' 'that' 'He may make the Bread the Body, and the Cup the Blood,' in the Liturgy of St. Mark;³ like language in that of St. Basil;⁴ these are but illustrations of a constant feature of the Eastern rites. In the Western Missal the plural is almost invariably used. 'We ask and pray that Thou wouldest accept and bless these gifts, these offerings, these holy unspotted sacrifices which we offer unto Thee'; 'We beseech, Lord, that Thou mayest propitiously receive this offering of our service and also of Thy whole family'; 'We, Thy servants, and also Thy holy people,' 'offer unto Thy glorious majesty from Thy own gifts and boons a pure offering, a holy offering, an unspotted offering, the holy Bread of eternal life and the Cup of everlasting salvation,'⁵ are phrases which mark its tone. In our own Prayer Book, the words 'Hear us, O merciful Father, we humbly beseech Thee' and 'our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving'; in the Scotch Communion Office, 'We Thy humble servants do celebrate and make' 'the memorial Thy Son hath commanded us to make'; the same words in that of the American Church, show that this great principle of Eucharistic worship has not been lost among Anglicans. The immemorial rule of the whole Church which forbids the Eucharist to be celebrated without the presence of some representative of the congregation, testifies to the same truth that the offering is made by the whole body of the faithful. Yet the body of the Church cannot perform the function of Eucharistic Sacrifice without the special organ by means of which the Sacrifice is offered, any more than the natural body can perform the function of sight without the eye. The whole Christian Church is a 'royal priesthood,' but it cannot do some parts of its priestly work without specially appointed priests to act as its instruments. It was not otherwise with the Jews. They too were a 'kingdom of priests,' a 'holy nation.'⁶ When Korah and his company made a claim that 'all the congregation' was 'holy,'⁷ they were building upon

¹ See Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, i. 53.

² *Ibid.* p. 87.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 133-4.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 405-6.

⁵ Canon Missæ.

⁶ Ex. xix. 6.

⁷ Numb. xvi. 3.

a tr
the p
spec

I
Euch
whol
appo
the p
to re
right
prom
from
com
tion
us o
Dr.
whic
conf
poin
com
have

of th
to in
the
St. 2
in th
the v
the
duri
own
him
Divi

testi
migh
notifi

He

his v
that
hum
insta
mus
mess

a truth, although they misunderstood it. Yet specific acts of the priestly nation could only be performed by means of a specially appointed priesthood.

If, then, it is the theology of the Catholic Church that the Eucharistic offering, to keep to our instance, is the act of the whole body, though it can only be made by means of specially appointed ministers, it would be in no way surprising if all the promises and gifts for the life of the Church were made to representatives of that whole body to which the actions rightly belong. And if it should become clear that the promises and gifts were so made, we should still have to ask from Christian history an answer to the question how the community thus richly endowed had declared that its functions could be performed. To discuss that answer would lead us outside the scope of the present article into regions which Dr. Hort had hoped to deal with in subsequent lectures which he never delivered. It must suffice here to express our confidence that any fair investigation of Christian history points to the fact that the Christian body from the first was committed to the essential features of the theology which we have described as that of the Catholic Church.

Another subject of interest discussed by Dr. Hort is that of the meaning and purpose of the laying on of hands referred to in several places in the New Testament. The consideration of the difficult phrase *κατὰ τὰς προαγοῦσας ἐπὶ σὲ προφητείας* in I St. Timothy i. 18, leads Dr. Hort to translate it, as it is translated in the margin of the Revised Version, 'the prophecies which led the way to thee,' and to interpret it of 'mysterious monitions of the kind called prophetic' which 'seemed to come to' St. Paul during his second missionary journey, 'whether within his own spirit, or through the lips of Silas, or both,' which 'taught him the course to take by which he should at last find a Divinely provided successor to Barnabas,' so that

'When at last St. Paul reached Derbe and Lystra . . . the testimony which the young Timothy received from the brethren might well seem to be a human echo of a Divine choice already notified by prophecy' (pp. 181-3).

He then goes on to say

'If St. Paul received Timothy as Divinely made the partner of his work in place of Barnabas, it would be at least not unnatural that there should be some repetition of the solemn acts by which human experience had been given to the Divine mission in the first instance. If this explanation of "the prophecies" is right, they must on the one hand have in substance included some such message as "Separate for me Timothy for the work whereunto I

have called him ;" and on the other hand that separation or consecration would naturally take outward form in fasting and prayer and laying on of hands by the representatives of the Lycaonian Ecclesiæ, in repetition of what had been done at Antioch (xiii. 3)' (p. 183).

Following this line of thought, Dr. Hort explains both 1 St. Timothy iv. 14 and 2 St. Timothy i. 6 of a laying on of hands upon St. Timothy in Lycaonia when he first became the companion of St. Paul. The command in 1 St. Timothy v. 22, 'Lay hands hastily on no man,' he interprets as referring to 'the act of blessing by which penitents were received back into the communion of the faithful' (pp. 214-5). His conclusions on the subject generally are thus stated :

'The only passages of the New Testament in which laying on of hands is connected with an act answering to ordination are four, viz. Acts vi. 6, the laying on of the hands of the Twelve on the Seven at their first appointment ; Acts xiii. 3, the laying on of the hands of the representatives of the Ecclesiæ of Antioch on Barnabas and Saul in consequence of a prophetic monition sending them forth ; and the two passages about Timothy, likewise, as we have lately seen, due in all probability to another prophetic monition sending him forth on a unique mission intimately connected with that former mission. Jewish usage in the case of Rabbis and their disciples renders it highly probable that (as a matter of fact) laying on of hands was largely practised in the Ecclesiæ of the Apostolic age as a rite introductory to ecclesiastical office. But as the New Testament tell us no more than what has been already mentioned, it can hardly be likely that any essential principle was held to be involved in it. It was enough that an Ecclesiæ should in modern phrase be organized, or in the really clearer Apostolic phrase be treated as a body made up of members with a diversity of functions ; and that all things should be done decently and in order' (pp. 215-6).

We cannot say we think this treatment satisfactory. It does not give weight to the inferences as to the meaning of the laying on of hands in the time of the Apostles which may rightly be derived from the practice of the second and third and fourth and fifth centuries.¹ There is hardly sufficient evidence for expressly referring the laying on of hands upon St. Timothy to the time of his first becoming the companion of St. Paul. We should have liked to see from the pen of so accurate a scholar as Dr. Hort some discussion of the different phrases, *μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως*,² where the action of the presbytery is spoken of, and *διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως*,³ where the

¹ There is a very useful statement on the practice of the early Church in Gore, *The Ministry of the Christian Church*, pp. 383-90.

² 1 St. Tim. iv. 14.

³ 2 St. Tim. i. 6.

act o
Tim
great
to us
tion
More
sent
this
learn
aban
recor
And
wholl
be do
than
Y
doctr
few p
may
is not
As th
the o
also t
with
mean
Here
prese
that
Chris
layin
W

1 S
Timoi
" cons
design
(κατὰ
secreat
(2) du
inspir
to by
aying
1 Tim
2 J
3 J
4 S
5 J
6 J
7 J

act of St. Paul is in view.¹ The interpretation of 1 St. Timothy v. 22 which he adopts, supported though it be by the great authority of Hammond² and of Bishop Ellicott,³ seems to us less in harmony with the context than the usual explanation that the phrase *χειρας ἐπιτίθει* refers to ordination. Moreover, the opinion of the Greek commentators, as represented by St. Chrysostom⁴ and Theodoret,⁵ is, in a matter of this kind, of some importance. As regards Acts xiii. 3, the learning and skill of Professor Ramsay⁶ have not led us to abandon the interpretation of the laying on of hands there recorded which has the authority of Bishop Lightfoot.⁷ And any argument which can be derived from Acts vi. 6 is wholly in favour of regarding passages which might otherwise be doubtful as referring rather to the appointment to an office than to the sending out on a mission.

Yet here, as on a previous point, we do not think the doctrine of the Church depends on the interpretation of these few passages in the New Testament. Whatever their meaning may be, we have to learn from Christian history what is or is not to be regarded as involving 'any essential principle.' As the judgment of the Christian body must decide what are the organs by which it can exercise its various functions, so also the judgment of the Christian body, acting in accordance with Divinely appointed methods, must decide by what means its ministers are to receive their specific powers. Here again we touch a question outside the limits of our present article, and it must suffice to record our conviction that the ceremonial act which the judgment of historical Christianity has affirmed to be essential to ordination is the laying on of the Bishop's hands.

We pass on to consider Dr. Hort's opinion on the use of

¹ See Liddon, *Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy*, p. 49. Dr. Liddon explains the 'references to Timothy's "consecration" to be "Bishop" of Ephesus' as follows: '1. He was designated for the position by inspired utterances of Christian prophets (*κατὰ τὰς προαγούσας ἐπὶ σὲ προφητείας*, 1 Tim. i. 18). 2. He was "consecrated" to it by St. Paul (1) *διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου*, 2 Tim. i. 6; (2) *διὰ προφητείας*, 1 Tim. iv. 14: i.e. by imposition of hands and an inspired utterance accompanying it. 3. His consecration was assented to by the body of presbyters in Ephesus, who signified this assent by laying their hands on him (*μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου*), 1 Tim. iv. 14.'

² Hammond, *in loco*.

³ Ellicott, *in loco*.

⁴ St. Chrys. *In 1 Ep. ad Tim. Hom. xvi. 1.*

⁵ Theodoret, *in loco*.

⁶ Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, pp. 64-8.

⁷ Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 96.

the word *ἐπίσκοπος* and its relation to *πρεσβύτερος* in the New Testament. The passages of chief importance on this subject are Acts xx. 28, Philippians i. 1, 1 St. Timothy iii. 1-7, and St. Titus i. 7.¹ Assuming that the persons referred to as *ἐπίσκοποι* in the first of these passages are the same as the *πρεσβύτεροι*, Dr. Hort does not regard *ἐπίσκοπος* as a 'second title,' but thinks that 'it retains its common etymological or descriptive meaning, "overseer,"' and that 'this meaning alone gives a clear sense here;' and suggests as the 'best rendering' the sentence 'in which the Holy Spirit set you to have oversight,' marking that the 'force' is 'distinctly predicative' (pp. 98-9). He similarly assumes in the fourth passage that the person referred to as *ἐπίσκοπος* is a *πρεσβύτερος*, similarly rejects the idea that it is a 'second title,' and explains its 'descriptive' use as follows:

'If *ἐπίσκοπον* is a title of office, the article before it is without motive, and *ἀνέγκλητον εἶναι* following it is a tame repetition when *εἰ τις ἐστὶν ἀνέγκλητος* has preceded. But taken descriptively it supplies a link which gives force to every other word. "A man who is to be made an Elder should be one who is *ἀνέγκλητος*, for (*γὰρ*) he that hath oversight must needs be *ἀνέγκλητος* as a steward of God." "Elder" is the title, "oversight" is the function to be exercised by the holder of the title within the Ecclesia' (pp. 190-1).

The second passage, that in Philippians i. 1, is treated at some length. Taking it after the 'illustration afforded by the Pastoral Epistles,' Dr. Hort writes thus:

'If the verse stood alone, no one would hesitate before assuming that these' (*σὺν ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνοις*) 'are two titles of two offices, *ἐπίσκοποι* and *διάκονοι*. Of course it would not follow that *ἐπισκόποις* bears here its later monarchical sense: the plural (being addressed to a single Ecclesia), and what is known of the arrangements of the Apostolic age generally would show the office to be one shared in by at least a plurality of persons in the same Ecclesia. But then we have to face the fact that this Epistle stands chronologically between St. Paul's words at Miletus and his letter to Titus and 1 Timothy, which agree in using *ἐπίσκοπος*, not as a title synonymous with the title *πρεσβύτερος*, Elder, but as a word describing the function of the persons entitled Elders. In other words, *ἐπισκόποις*, if a title in Philippians i. 1, would imply a more advanced state of things than that of the Pastoral Epistles. The clue to what seems the right interpretation is given by those thirteen verses of 1 Timothy iii.

¹ In 1 St. Pet. v. 2 *ἐπισκοποῦντες* is omitted by Westcott and Hort in their text and placed in the Appendix as a 'Pre-Syrian (?Western and Alexandrian) and Syrian' reading. It is in the received text and the text of the revisers, and is cited by Bishop Lightfoot in his *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, p. 97. It is omitted in the margin of the revised text.

which
two d
correc
and th
would
depend
and in
tion i
probab
Eccles
ward
organ
and su
there
was a
accor
the ne

In
quota
iii. 1
of ov
hath
ἐπίσκο
V

stand
the o
the M
as th
differ
regar
to ta
stood
Not
the v
In S
artic
artic
1 St
of a
equi

1
Weiz
Engl
state
Phil
2
Com

which we were considering lately. St. Paul does not mean simply two different offices, but two contrasted offices; or (to speak more correctly) two contrasted functions, "with them that have oversight, and them that do service [minister]." On the common view he would be simply sending salutations to the two sets of men independently of the salutation to the "saints" at Philippi generally: and in that case we might find it hard to explain why such a salutation is withheld in writing to other Ecclesiæ. In reality he is probably thinking less of the men coming under either head than of the Ecclesia as a whole; these two functions are to him the main outward manifestations that the community of saints was indeed an organized body, needing and possessing government on the one side and service on the other. It would matter little how many offices there were, with or without titles—two, or three, or twenty. That was a matter of external arrangement, which might vary endlessly according to circumstances. The essential thing was to recognize the need of the two fundamental types of function' (pp. 211-13).

In accordance with this position, as implied in the last quotation, Dr. Hort explains the passage in 1 St. Timothy iii. 1 to mean 'If any man seeketh after ἐπισκοπῆς (a function of oversight), he desireth a good work. He therefore that hath oversight must needs be free from reproach (δεῖ οὖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίλημπτον εἶναι)' (p. 193).

We agree with Dr. Hort in continuing to accept, notwithstanding what has lately been said by some competent writers,¹ the opinion that the persons referred to in various passages in the New Testament under the word ἐπίσκοπος are the same as those described as πρεσβύτεροι. We are compelled to differ from him when he denies that ἐπίσκοπος is to be regarded as a 'title of office.' It seems to us most natural to take it as such in Acts xx. 28, although if that passage stood alone no satisfactory argument could be based upon it. Not only in Philippians i. 1, but also in 1 St. Timothy iii. 1-8, does the use of ἐπίσκοποι appear to be parallel to that of διάκονοι. In St. Titus i. 7 Dr. Hort considers that the presence of the article supports his view. 'If ἐπίσκοπον is a title of office, the article before it is without motive.' The article occurs also in 1 St. Timothy iii. 2. In neither case does it exclude the title of an office. The singular word with it is substantially equivalent to an English plural.² Dr. Hort also lays stress

¹ The ἐπίσκοποι are distinguished from the πρεσβύτεροι by, e.g., Weizsäcker, *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church*, ii. 326-31, English translation. The argument for the identification of them is stated with great clearness in Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, pp. 96-9.

² See Winer, *A Grammar of the New Testament Diction*, xviii. 1. Compare Jelf, *A Grammar of the Greek Language*, § 446, β.

on the repetition ἀνέγκλητον εἶναι after εἴ τις ἐστὶν ἀνέγκλητος and on the force of γάρ. We do not think the argument from the repetition of much weight; both it and the connexion of the sentences by the word γάρ appear to be not unnatural means of emphasizing that anyone who is appointed to the offices in view must be ἀνέγκλητος. If, then, there is no sufficient reason for rejecting the opinion that in the Pastoral Epistles the word ἐπίσκοπος is used for the title of an office, Dr. Hort's first reason for rejecting that interpretation in Philippians i. 1—namely, that it 'would imply a more advanced state of things than that of the Pastoral Epistles'—falls to the ground. His second reason, that if ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι denote 'two sets of men,' it is 'hard to explain why such a salutation is withheld in writing to other Ecclesiæ,' may perhaps be met by a reference to the note on the passage in which Bishop Lightfoot says:

'The contributions were probably sent to St. Paul in the name of the officers as well as of the church generally; compare Acts xv. 23. Hence St. Paul mentions them in reply.'¹

Moreover, it is right to give weight to the use of the word outside the New Testament. St. Clement of Rome, writing before the end of the first century, plainly uses ἐπίσκοπος as the title of an office, and speaks of the office itself as ἐπισκοπή;² while a few years later, in the time of St. Ignatius, ἐπίσκοπος is firmly fixed in this sense. That it came to be used for a different office may affect in some respects the bearing of this argument; it does not destroy it, since the change from one office to another—albeit involved in some difficulties—is easier to understand than the more complete change which would be necessitated by Dr. Hort's position.

As before, our dissent is critical rather than theological. So far as theology is concerned, the question is, not by what names the holders of ecclesiastical offices are denoted in the New Testament, but what are the powers there seen to be existing in the Church.³

Another point of some interest on which we cannot

¹ Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, p. 82.

² St. Clem. Rom. *Ad Cor.* i. 42, 44.

³ In the 'recapitulation' at the end of the last lecture Dr. Hort speaks of 'the monarchical principle' as being 'the essence of episcopacy' (p. 232). Surely the 'essence of episcopacy' is the power of ordaining, and would exist alike in a diocesan monarchical bishop and in a college of bishops such as that which, e.g., Dr. Langen (*Geschichte der Römischen Kirche*) supposes to have originally existed in the West.

altogether
St. Jan
that th
the Eld
that 't
brethren
hardly
it does
positio
διὸ ἐγὼ
vote.
rather
the de
And, s
before
pared
is, in c
relatio

'the fa
was ev
his clo

In
passa
carefu
defini
proce

'F
that n
of ma
corres
sancti
whole
One
Eccle
to the
St. I
betw
Eccle

1
Chur
pres
the r
byte
pres
are

altogether follow Dr. Hort is with regard to the position of St. James at the Council of Jerusalem. It is of course clear that the decision of the Council was that of 'the Apostles and the Elders with' the concurrence of 'the whole Ecclesia,'¹ that 'the letter proceeds from the Apostles and the elder brethren,' and that 'apart' 'from these two classes he can hardly have exercised authority in this matter' (p. 81). But it does not seem to us so clear that St. James had no special position at the Council, and we question whether his words, διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω, are rightly interpreted as the mere giving of a vote. Standing in their context they appear to us to imply rather that St. James, as the president, was putting into shape the decision of the Council at the end of the discussion. And, similarly, the mention of St. James in the first place, before St. Peter, in Galatians ii. 9, especially when it is compared with the parallel phraseology in Acts xii. 17, xxi. 18,² is, in our judgment, more naturally explained by his special relation to Jerusalem than by

'the fact that the adherence of James on the occasion referred to was even more significant than that of the other two, on account of his closer relations with the Jewish party' (p. 79).

In connexion with the Epistle to the Ephesians there is a passage on the unity of the Church which calls for very careful attention. After speaking of 'the idea now first definitely expressed of the whole Ecclesia as one,' Dr. Hort proceeds:

'Before leaving this subject, however, it is important to notice that not a word in the Epistle exhibits the One Ecclesia as made up of many Ecclesiæ. To each local Ecclesia St. Paul has ascribed a corresponding unity of its own; each is a body of Christ and a sanctuary of God; but there is no grouping of them into partial wholes or into one great whole. The members which make up the One Ecclesia are not communities but individual men. The One Ecclesia includes all members of all partial Ecclesiæ; but its relations to them all are direct, not mediate. It is true that, as we have seen, St. Paul anxiously promoted friendly intercourse and sympathy between the scattered Ecclesiæ; but the unity of the universal Ecclesia as he contemplated it does not belong to this region; it is

¹ We have somewhat enlarged Dr. Hort's phrase 'with the whole Church' in recognition that, while the general body of Christians were present at the discussion (Acts xv. 12) and concurred in the passing of the resolutions (xv. 22), the appeal was made to the Apostles and presbyters (xv. 2), the Council is described as the meeting of the Apostles and presbyters (xv. 6), and, according to the most probable reading, the laity are not mentioned in the letter (xv. 23).

² See Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 109.

a truth of the theology and of religion, not a fact of what we call Ecclesiastical politics. To recognize this is quite consistent with the fullest appreciation of aspirations after an external Ecclesiastical unity which have played so great and beneficial a part in the inner and outer movements of subsequent ages. At every turn we are constrained to feel that we can learn to good effect from the apostolic age only by studying its principles and ideals, not by copying its precedents.

'I said just now that the one Ecclesia of Ephesians includes all members of all partial Ecclesiæ. In other words, there is no indication that St. Paul regarded the conditions of membership in the universal Ecclesia as differing from the conditions of membership in the partial local Ecclesiæ. Membership of a local Ecclesia was obviously visible and external, and we have no evidence that St. Paul regarded membership of the universal Ecclesia as invisible, and exclusively spiritual, and as shared by only a limited number of the members of the external Ecclesiæ, those, namely, whom God had chosen out of the great mass and ordained to life, of those whose faith in Christ was a genuine and true faith. What very plausible grounds could be urged for this distinction was to be seen in later generations; but it seems to me incompatible with any reasonable interpretation of St. Paul's words. On the other hand, it is no less clear that this Epistle, which so emphatically expounds the doctrine of the Christian community, is equally emphatic in recognition of the individual life of its members. The universal Ecclesia and the partial Ecclesiæ alike were wholly made up of men who had each for himself believed, whose baptism was for each the outward expression of what was involved in his belief, for his past and for his future; and who had a right to look on the fact that they had been permitted to be the subjects of this marvellous change as evidence that they had each been the object of God's electing love before the foundations of the world were laid' (pp. 168-70).

We are not at all disposed to commit ourselves to agreement with all that is stated or implied in the paragraphs we have just quoted. Before doing so we should wish to know more precisely what Dr. Hort meant by a 'partial local Ecclesia;' to receive much explanation of the sentence

'we are constrained to feel that we can learn to good effect from the apostolic age only by studying its principles and ideals, not by copying its precedents;'

and to have a clearer understanding than we now possess of the meaning of the description of Baptism as 'the outward expression of what was involved in his belief.' Moreover, we are of opinion that in part of an earlier lecture (pp. 145-6), the conclusions of which are assumed in the paragraphs now before us, teaching of St. Paul which refers to the universal Church is applied to local communities. But the general purport of the paragraphs is independent of these considera-

tions.
truth.
unity
church
subjec
many
never
depend
Christ
it out
menta
its bei
comm
a resu
extern
in its
One U
Head
His S
times
'bran
sisten
cravin
becau
has be

In
disting
dom o

'S
Heave
Gospe
This i
on thi
ground
hensiv
repres
of its
are no
able to
about

N
mean
the o
refer
visibl
sess,

tions. They are, in their main teaching, full of most valuable truth. It cannot be too strongly insisted on that the essential unity of the Church does not consist in the relation of local churches to one another. The recovery or maintenance of subjective unity is indeed greatly to be desired, and is worth many and great sacrifices. The value attached to it should never lead to failure to recognize the fact that organic unity depends on that union with our Lord which individual Christians receive in the Sacraments. They cannot possess it outside the communion of the Church because Sacramental life necessitates such communion as the condition of its being received and itself spiritually unites those who in common receive it. The development of personal graces as a result of union with Christ may be greatly helped by the external union of Christians, or hindered by the lack of it. But, in its essential characteristics, they have their position in the One Universal Church because of their relation to the Divine Head of the Church and their union with Him by means of His Sacred Humanity. Forgetfulness of this truth has sometimes led, on the one hand, to the statement of the so-called 'branch theory' of the Church in ways that are hardly consistent with Catholic theology, and, on the other hand, to a craving after external reunion, which has been unhealthy because, in its eagerness to gain what we are now without, it has been unmindful of that which we actually possess.

In connexion with the same subject we must notice a distinction between the 'Christian Ecclesia' and the 'Kingdom of Heaven' which is made in the first lecture.

'Since Augustine's time,' it is there said, 'the Kingdom of Heaven or Kingdom of God, of which we read so often in the Gospels, has been simply identified with the Christian Ecclesia. This is a not unnatural deduction from some of our Lord's sayings on this subject taken by themselves; but it cannot, I think, hold its ground when the whole range of His teaching about it is comprehensively examined. We may speak of the Ecclesia as the visible representative of the Kingdom of God, or as the primary instrument of its sway, or under other analogous forms of language. But we are not justified in identifying the one with the other, so as to be able to apply directly to the Ecclesia whatever is said in the Gospels about the Kingdom of Heaven or of God' (p. 19).

Now we do not feel by any means clear as to the exact meaning which Dr. Hort wished to be attached to several of the expressions in this quotation. It is possible he was referring to the truth that those who, though outside the visible Church, have been faithful to such light as they possess, may receive grace through the operation of the power of

God, and was drawing inferences from it which we cannot but regard as illogical and mistaken. The phrases 'visible representative of the Kingdom of God,' 'primary instrument of its sway,' make it more likely, we think, that he had in view that the visible Church on earth, as he called it, the 'One Ecclesia,' is only a part of the whole mystical Body of Christ, and that the greater part of the whole Body has passed in death beyond the veil. If it be so, these obscure sentences contain the recognition of a truth which is too little remembered. We are not likely to have right ideas about the constitution of the Church if we are forgetting that Christians upon earth are a very small part of the Church. To give but one instance of misconception that is connected with such practical forgetfulness, it would hardly be argued that the Church as being a Body must have a human Head on earth in the person of the Bishop of Rome if it were sufficiently kept in mind that the Church on earth is only part of the Body.¹

Dr. Hort's great knowledge and skill as a critic of the New Testament makes his judgment valuable on questions of criticism. It is to be noticed that his general method implies throughout the acceptance of the traditional beliefs about the

¹ Since this article was in type an important work by the Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology in the University of Oxford, entitled *Ministerial Priesthood*, has been published. On pages 22-9 there is a note on (among others) the passages in *The Christian Ecclesia* upon which we have last commented. Dr. Moberly expresses the opinion that Dr. Hort's book shows to an excessive degree 'the temper of theological hesitation and reserve.' This excess of caution is probably partly responsible for the ambiguities which we have noticed. In his Preface (pp. xiv-xv) Dr. Moberly points out that the 'solid judgment' and 'living and illuminating enthusiasm' of Dr. Hort would have been more serviceable if there had been less 'tendency' in him 'to try to work what are called the historical or exegetical methods, as if it were possible that they should yield their best results apart from the light of the truths of dogmatic theology.' There is also a very useful note on pp. 127-9 on Dr. Hort's treatment of St. Matthew xxviii. 16-20 and St. John xx. 19-23. In the course of it Dr. Moberly says, 'To say indeed that the commission of authority for government formally given to them [*i.e.* the Apostles] was given to them not exclusively but representatively, that is, to them as representing the Church, and as ordained to exercise ministerially the authority of the Church, is the very view which the previous chapters have endeavoured to explain.' So far as Dr. Hort is feeling after this, we shall fully sympathize with him. But this view, instead of denying, presupposes, and instead of explaining away, *bases itself upon a real commission of authority* for government, delivered to the Apostles as representing the Church, and delivered to the Church to be administered through the Apostles—and through those after them who should in other generations be similarly "sent." The sense in which the words 'representing the Church' are used is shown by pp. 66-73.

books
the P

'O
no mo
arising
bearing
they n
me of
in the
source
interva
death
must a

For
now b
of EL
Unive
factor
Chape
Abbe
There
contai
Colleg

Li
yield
readin
many
thoug
gether
are wi

Th
reader
those
sugge
parts
are in
that w
of the
which
laity f
siastic

Th
comp

¹ C
Dr. M
VOL

books of the New Testament, and that he says expressly of the Pastoral Epistles :

'Of the questions of their authenticity and integrity I shall say no more now than that in spite of by no means trivial difficulties, arising from comparison of the diction of these and the other Epistles bearing St. Paul's name, I believe them to be his, and to be his as they now stand. The supposed difficulties of other kinds seem to me of no weight. About St. Paul's life after the time briefly noticed in the last verse of Acts, we know absolutely nothing from any other source beyond the bare fact of his death at Rome ; and it is to the interval between the Roman captivity mentioned in Acts and his death that the Epistles, with the recent events referred to in them, must assuredly belong' (p. 171).

Four sermons are added to the lectures in the volume now before us. The first of them was preached at the Bishop of Ely's ordination in June 1873, the second before the University of Cambridge at the Commemoration of Benefactors in October 1875, the third in Emmanuel College Chapel in February 1889, and the fourth in Westminster Abbey at the consecration of Bishop Westcott in 1890. There is also an Appendix, connected with the third sermon, containing a description of the decoration of Emmanuel College Chapel.

Like much of Dr. Hort's work, these sermons will not yield their meaning to a hasty reading or even to one careful reading. There are passages in them which we have read many times without feeling that we have gathered all their thought. This is perhaps to imply that they are not altogether suitable for sermons ; it is certainly to assert that they are wisely reproduced in a book.

The whole work, indeed, is likely to be useful only to readers who will spend a good deal of time over it. For those who will do so it is calculated to stimulate inquiry and suggest fruitful lines of thought. Not the least valuable parts of it are those in which principles are laid down which are inconsistent with any such view of Christian history as that which is suggested by the late Dr. Hatch's *Organisation of the Early Christian Churches*,¹ or with the temper of mind which would substitute the judgment of individual clergy or laity for the decisions, doctrinal or disciplinary, of due ecclesiastical authority.

There are points, as we have shown, on which we feel compelled to interpret passages in the New Testament

¹ Compare the newly published work referred to in a previous note, Dr. Moberly's *Ministerial Priesthood*, pp. 22-4.

differently from Dr. Hort. But we are sure that even those who do not altogether follow him may learn much from what he has written in defence of the conclusions which they do not accept. To consider carefully what he says on any subject, and then go back to the well-known passages in the Greek Testament of which he treats, whether one agrees with him or whether one does not, is to find that one has gained something.

We have laid a great deal of emphasis on the fact that, even supposing we are wrong in rejecting some of the opinions expressed in this book, it would not follow that any position necessary to the maintenance of the Catholic doctrine of the Church and the Ministry would have to be abandoned. Possibly some of our readers may think that this is in itself so clear that we have been wasting time and space which we might well have given to the discussion of some other matters in Dr. Hort's work. We have written these portions of our article for practical reasons. It has, we understand, been feared by some loyal Churchmen that the publication of *The Christian Ecclesia* is likely to be hurtful to Catholic truth. And in different quarters it has been very confidently asserted that Dr. Hort has dealt a deadly blow at doctrines to which we, as faithful members of the Church of England, are deeply committed. Thus, on the appearance of this work, it was hailed with a cordial welcome by the *Daily News*, which, in the course of its review, proceeded to say that the learned author's 'conclusions' were 'entirely hostile to all ecclesiastical pretensions' and to the existence of any 'such thing as succession to the Apostles,' and ended by declaring that

'these valuable, interesting, and timely lectures will do much, no doubt, to sustain, strengthen, and encourage the laity of the Church of England in their ever increasing revolt against the revival of clerical pretension and exclusiveness which has been the most regrettable result of the Tractarian movement.'¹

How untrue an estimate of *The Christian Ecclesia* this is we hope we have done something to show, and we hardly think Dr. Hort would have felt it to be any part of his work to supply material for resistance to the essential features of the teaching of the Tractarians on the subject of the Ministry.

As in the case of other posthumous works by the same author, we have to thank the Rev. J. O. F. Murray for his careful performance of the task of editor.

¹ *Daily News*, June 23, 1897.

Alfred

WE c
plishm
of four
a reas
rally
the m
taking
by its
aversi
with
Tenny
extrem
and o
able t
these
of the
gravin
strikin
taken
autho
them
rise fr
hance
noble
moral
even

A
Augu
Scotch
Quar
come
table
Barth
Olive
ton M
tion
From
fourth
and

ART. V.—TENNYSON.

Alfred, Lord Tennyson. A Memoir by his Son. 2 Vols.
(London, 1897.)

WE congratulate Lord Tennyson on this successful accomplishment of a difficult task, albeit a labour of love, the work of four years, as he tells us on his concluding page. To satisfy a reasonable desire to learn something more than was generally known of the poet's life and work, without pandering to the morbid curiosity that is so common, was no light undertaking. The subject of this Memoir (as it is modestly styled by its author) used to express in the strongest language his aversion to the biography of the day, which pursues genius with relentless persistency into its most sacred privacy. Lord Tennyson has steered his course steadily between the two extremes, and has offered a filial tribute worthy of his father, and one that we believe would have been thoroughly acceptable to him. But he has accomplished more than this. In these two handsome volumes, illustrated by six photographs of the poet, besides a series of other interesting sketches, engravings, and facsimiles of original manuscripts, we have a striking light thrown upon the genesis of the poems. We are taken at times, as it were, into the very laboratory of their author, and furnished with a highly valuable comment on them from his own hand, and by his self-criticism; and we rise from the perusal of the Memoir as a whole with an enhanced idea of its subject, as a grand creation, not less in noble appearance and physical strength than in genius and moral excellence, and feel that the man himself was greater even than his work.

Alfred Tennyson was born in the Rectory at Somersby, on August 6, 1809, the year in which Byron's *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* was published. The first number of the *Quarterly Review*, containing three articles by Scott, had come out in the previous January. The same year—a veritable *annus mirabilis*—saw the birth of Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy, Charles Darwin, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Abraham Lincoln, Richard Monckton Milnes, and William Ewart Gladstone. Of this constellation of seven luminaries the last alone is now surviving. From his father, Dr. George Clayton Tennyson, Alfred, the fourth of his twelve children, inherited his vigorous frame; and 'all that he and his brothers learnt of languages, of the

fine arts, of mathematics, and natural science, until they went to Cambridge, was learnt from him' (i. 16). The four years when he was at the grammar school at Louth, living there at his grandmother's house, seem to have contributed little to his intellectual growth. 'How I did hate that school!' he said, looking back on it in his old age; 'the only good I ever got from it was the memory of the words *'sonus desiliantis aquæ,'* and of an old wall covered with wild weeds opposite the school windows' (i. 7). Dr. Tennyson was a Hebrew and Syriac scholar, and perfected himself in Greek in order that he might teach his sons, and from him the poet said he himself received a good but not a regular classical education. Fortunately there was in the Rectory an excellent library, of which Alfred and his brothers had the benefit. There was a strong atmosphere of poetry about the whole family. The father, we are told, could write regular metre very skilfully, and his sister, Mrs. Matthew Russell, dabbled in poetry, while Alfred had thoroughly kindred spirits in Frederick, his eldest brother, the author of *Days and Hours*, who still survives in his ninety-first year, and in Charles Turner Tennyson, for whose *Collected Sonnets*, published in 1880, the Laureate wrote—

'Midnight—in no midsummer tune—
The breakers lash the shores'

as a preface. On the early poems there is no need to dwell at any length. It was more true of Tennyson than of Pope that he 'lisp'd in numbers, for the numbers came.' Before he could read he was in the habit on a stormy day of spreading out his arms to the wind, and crying out, 'I hear a voice that's speaking in the wind.' When he was about eight years old he covered two sides of a slate with Thomsonian blank verse in praise of flowers; at about ten or eleven he could write and improvise hundreds of lines in the Popeian metre, and at about twelve and onward wrote an epic of six thousand lines *à la* Walter Scott, and never felt himself more truly inspired. The specimens given in the *Memoir* of unpublished poems of boyhood were naturally omitted from the volume of *Poems by Two Brothers* as too *bizarre*, but they are strikingly original, especially the weird *Coach of Death*, which reminds us a little of some parts of the *Vision of Sin*. As Jowett said, 'it is wonderful how the whelp could have known such things.' He would constantly repeat in a loud murmur the new passages or new lines as they came to him, a habit which caused the cook at Somersby Rectory to say, 'What is Master Awlfred always a-praying for?' On February 20, 1828, Alfred and

his
their
Brow
Alfre
assist
failing
mont
circu
meda
galax
dawn
vivid
the p
1830
Pyre
the S
speci
along
thirty
storie
theles
ford
prove
house
a visi
throu
sider
note

(The
there
of the
poem
Halla
spoke
seen t
his fri
more
lencie
There

1 7
Stopfor

his brother Charles went up to Trinity, Cambridge, where their elder brother Frederick had already gained Sir William Browne's medal for the best Greek ode in imitation of Sappho. Alfred remained at Cambridge till February 1831, when his assistance was required at home by his mother, owing to the failing health of Dr. Tennyson, who died in the following month. Of his residence at the University the most notable circumstances were (1) his winning the Chancellor's gold medal for his *Timbuctoo* in 1829, (2) the very remarkable galaxy of college friends among whom he lived in 'those dawn-golden times,' and who seem to have been at once vividly impressed with the belief in his future greatness, (3) the publication of his first volume, *Poems chiefly Lyrical*, in 1830, and, lastly, his expedition with Arthur Hallam to the Pyrenees in the summer of the same year, to render aid to the Spanish insurgents—a visit fruitful in inspiration, as was specially evinced in *Enone*, begun at this time, and in 'All along the valley' composed on his second visit to Caunteretz, thirty-one years later. *Timbuctoo* is less known than the stories that have gathered around its composition. Nevertheless there is a real interest attaching to it, for, as Mr. Stopford Brooke says,¹ 'Tennyson's conception of the subject proves that he had now seen that Fable was the great storehouse of poetic material. He builds the *Timbuctoo* of Fable; a vision like that of El Dorado. He weaves it through and through with spiritual thought.' Already there is a considerable command of the blank-verse measure. Already we note the love of alliteration, e.g. in

'Thou with lavished sense
Listenest the lordly music flowing from
The illimitable years.'

(The last two lines he inserted in the *Ode to Memory*.) And there is the clear and living insight into the sights and scenes of the outer world. Matthew Arnold, when he first read the poem, prophesied the greatness of Tennyson, while Arthur Hallam, himself an unsuccessful competitor for the prize, spoke of 'the splendid imaginative power that pervades it, seen through all hindrances.' On the appearance in 1830 of his friend's first volume, *Poems chiefly Lyrical*, Hallam is still more enthusiastic, and particularizes in it five distinct excellencies in his manner, which our space forbids us to enumerate. There ensues the long period in the poet's life which reaches

¹ Tennyson, *his Art and Relation to Modern Life*, ch. i. p. 62. By Stopford A. Brooke (London, 1894).

to 1850, a period marked during its earlier half by solitude, disparagement, and concentration on work, but terminating in triumph and happiness. It comprises the passage from competence, and even less than that for a season, to the prospect at least of wealth, from partial recognition to established fame, from loss and gloom and depression to union with a noble helpmate, 'a wife for Shakespeare's self.' It is quite a mistake to suppose, as has sometimes been asserted, that Tennyson rose almost at once to poetic eminence. The Cambridge 'Apostles' and his other University friends were his warm supporters, but he felt keenly the 'comically aggressive' article by 'Musty-fusty-rusty Christopher' in *Blackwood* (vol. xxxi.), and later on the 'acrid and contemptuous' *Quarterly* Reviewer, after the appearance of his volume in 1832, an old Lincolnshire squire of the time impressing on him that the *Quarterly* was 'the next book to God's Bible' (i. 94, 206). The opening of this period was brightened by constant intercourse with Arthur Hallam, who had become engaged to Emily Tennyson in 1830, and was often at Somersby; and he and Alfred travelled together on the Rhine in 1832. Four sweet years were granted of closest friendship with the man of such eminent promise, and then

'Where the path began
To slant the fifth autumnal slope,
As we descended following Hope,
There sat the Shadow—
In Vienna's fatal walls
God's finger touched him and he slept.'

It was not till nearly seventeen years after the blow so crushing to Alfred and his sister that *In Memoriam* was published, and then at first anonymously, though the authorship was soon discovered. The germ of it is in a fragment given in vol. i. p. 107: 'Where is the voice I loved?' &c., and the first written sections of it were in the following order, ix., xxx., xxxi., lxxxv., xxviii.

The earliest jottings of the *Elegies*, as they were then called, were mislaid, and very nearly shared the fate of Carlyle's manuscript of the French Revolution. Lord Tennyson says—

'*The Two Voices, or Thoughts of a Suicide* was begun under the cloud of this overwhelming sorrow, which, as my father told me, for a while blotted out all joy from his life, and made him long for death, in spite of his feeling that he was in some measure a help and comfort to his sister. But such a first friendship and such a loss helped to reveal himself to himself, while he enshrined his sorrow in his song' (i. 109).

D
in the
was I
Ulyss
and b
anyth
expre

and

full o
symp
divid
Linco
bloss
songs
of w
caref
Appe
poem
espec
son's
of th
critic
was
artist
and b
siasti
with
loud
natin
for A
in th
self-c
Nor

The
of th
world
self-c
the S

During these sixteen years much of his finest early, and in the opinion of some, much of what is his very best work was produced. The lovely *English Idylls*, *Morte d'Arthur*, *Ulysses*, 'giving my feeling about the need of going forward and braving the struggle of life perhaps more simply than anything in *In Memoriam* (i. 196); *Locksley Hall*; the three expressly political lyrics,

'You ask me, why, tho' ill at ease,
Within this region I subsist,'

'Of old sat Freedom on the heights,'

and

'Love thou thy land, with love far brought,'

full of massive grandeur, widest patriotism, and large-minded sympathy with true social advance without merging the individual in the community; *Break, break, break* (made in a Lincolnshire lane at 3 o'clock in the morning between blossoming hedges), with many more of his most popular songs, and *The Princess* all belong to this time. Much also of what had been previously published was improved by careful omission, recasting, and polishing. A valuable Appendix by Aubrey de Vere on the reception of the early poems is given us (i. 501). It teems with admirable remarks, especially on the two volumes of 1842, which 'carried Tennyson's poetry beyond a narrower circle and fixed it in the heart of the nation.' He had profited by friendly and unfriendly criticism, and pruned his style. He said once, 'I suppose I was nearer thirty than twenty before I was anything of an artist' (i. 12). His comprehension of human life was enlarged and becoming matured. The new poems were welcomed enthusiastically, and not only in England; Hawthorn and Emerson with others in America, and Freiligrath in Germany, were loud in their praises. The most appreciative and discriminating of the reviews was that by Spedding in the *Edinburgh* for April 1843. There is hardly anything more remarkable in the history of literature than the long silence and severe self-discipline of those twelve years in Tennyson's career. Nor could it be said only of his literary work that

'Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control,
These three alone lead life to sovereign power.'

The words are emphatically true of his entire character and of the spirit in which he met 'the blows and buffets of the world' throughout this period. For it was a time of strict self-denial and economy. The family had, of course, to leave the Somersby Rectory, though they resided there until 1837,

moving then successively to High Beech, Tunbridge Wells, Boxley, and Maidstone, the latter place being chosen to be near the Lushingtons at Park House, Edmund Lushington having married the poet's sister Cecilia. Alfred showed not only sympathy but much practical good sense in the care of the family. He could seldom incur the expense of travelling to visit his friends, and had even to part with his gold medal, which was eventually rescued and given back to him by a cousin in 1885. From time to time he had fits of blank despondency, which prompted such lines as the pathetic couplet—

‘O leave not thou thy son forlorn ;
Teach me, great Nature : make me live.’

He was bracing himself ‘by faith that comes of self-control’ for the struggle of life, and the current of his mind began no longer to run in the channel of mournful memories and melancholy forebodings (i. 165). How sedulously he set himself to work is seen by the list of his week's studies before he left Somersby. It includes languages, history, theology, poetry, besides five branches of physical science. Each day's subject is carefully marked out. The first meeting between Tennyson and his future bride, Emily Sellwood, whose father was brother-in-law of the ‘heroic sailor’ Sir John Franklin, had taken place in 1830, and till 1836, when she was bridesmaid at her sister Louisa's marriage to Charles Turner Tennyson, they saw each other but rarely. An interesting selection is given from letters to her, 1838–40. After the latter date the correspondence between the two was entirely broken off for ten years, so unpromising were the prospects of the poet, who says in one of these extracts, ‘We must bear or we must die. It is easier, perhaps, to die, but infinitely less noble.’ But there was still a fresh trial in store, for he was led to invest all he had in a miserable scheme for wood-carving by machinery, which utterly collapsed, wrecking all his own little property and also a portion of that of a brother and sister. Then indeed, like Philip, ‘he had his dark hour.’ We read that ‘so severe a hypochondria set in upon him that his friends despaired of his life. ‘I have,’ he writes, ‘drunk one of those most bitter draughts out of the cup of life which go near to make men hate the world they move in’ (i. 221). More than twenty years later some of the thoughts and descriptions in *Sea Dreams* were suggested to him by this failure.

It was during this critical period of his life that, to quote from *Merlin and the Gleam*, the spirit of which has been caught so well by Lord Tennyson in his Preface, and which

to all
secre

But i
guide

T
were
Mon
obtai
story
bear

“
from
Chey
Tenn

“
as yo
the p
poetry
own,
“S
on th
get th
on yo

T
lyle's
as suc
ing a
into c
seem
which
Such
descr
conv
Indic
fortu
the n
and t
1850
Mem
being
volum
Sellw

to all who can read between the lines sums up the whole secret of his father's life work—

‘The light retreated,
The landskip darken’d,
The melody deaden’d.’

But it was only for a moment. The inner voice, the Divine guide, bade him go on and conquer.

The cloud was soon to lift. The year after his fortunes were at their lowest brought him a pension of 200*l.* annually. Monckton Milnes, the late Lord Houghton, induced Peel to obtain the grant, having first made him read *Ulysses*. The story of Carlyle's bringing pressure to bear upon Milnes will bear repetition.

“Richard Milnes,” said Carlyle one day, withdrawing his pipe from his mouth as they were seated together in the little house in Cheyne Row, “when are you going to get that pension for Alfred Tennyson?”

“My dear Carlyle,” responded Milnes, “the thing is not so easy as you seem to suppose. What will my constituents say if I do get the pension for Tennyson? They know nothing about him or his poetry, and they will probably think he is some poor relation of my own, and that the whole affair is a job.”

‘Solemn and emphatic was Carlyle's response. “Richard Milnes, on the Day of Judgment, when the Lord asks you why you didn't get that pension for Alfred Tennyson, it will not do to lay the blame on your constituents; it is *you* that will be damned.”’

Tennyson, it may be here remarked, was a man after Carlyle's own heart—the only contemporary poet for whom he cared as such. ‘A most restful, brotherly, solid-hearted man,’ ‘carrying a bit of chaos about with him, which he is manufacturing into cosmos,’ ‘a life-guardsman spoilt by making poetry,’ ‘there seems to be a note of “the Eternal Melodies” in this man; for which let all other men be thankful and joyful’ (i. 187, 213). Such are some of the ways in which the sage of Chelsea describes him, and we have three pages of very characteristic conversation between the two men (vol. ii. ch. x. *sub fin.*). Indications were not wanting about this time that Tennyson's fortunes were not to rest on adventitious aid, but were to be the natural outcome and well-deserved fruit of sustained effort, and the most unremitting cultivation of his art. Moxon in 1850 promised a small yearly royalty on his works if *In Memoriam* were published. This led to his engagement being renewed, and on June 13, the month in which that volume was brought out, Tennyson was married to Emily Sellwood at the picturesque village of Shiplake on the

Thames. 'The peace of God,' he says, 'came into my life before the altar when I wedded her.'

From this point onwards the life flows on in a steady, tranquil channel. It will be enough to indicate a few of the chief events by which it was diversified. In the November after his marriage he accepts the Poet-Laureateship, not without some hesitation, Venables wittily clenching his decision by the suggestion that, if he took it, whenever he dined out he would always be offered the liver-wing of a fowl. In 1855 he was made a D.C.L. at Oxford. The writer of this article was an undergraduate at the time, and remembers well how he came into the Sheldonian Theatre, towering above the rest who were to be presented with his somewhat rugged exterior, and how when some wag in the gallery cried out, 'Did they call you early, Mr. Tennyson?' he looked up in the direction of the voice with an amused smile. He found himself able to rent, and five years later to buy, Farringford, that much-loved home 'close to the ridge of a noble down.' Ten years after this, in 1868, the foundation stone of Aldworth, his other residence, was laid. Both of them are brought vividly before us in these volumes, as well as by Mrs. Richmond Ritchie.¹

In the Isle of Wight the sea, of which he was so passionately fond, was a perpetual source of interest to him, and inspired hundreds of magnificent lines and images, familiar to all his readers, though he admired the waves on the south coast less than those on the east, declaring that the finest seas he had ever seen were at Valencia, at Mablethorpe in Lincolnshire, and off West Cornwall. From his window at Aldworth the Weald of Sussex and the line of South Downs were spread out before him.

'He could gaze,' to quote a manuscript note of Aubrey de Vere (ii. 208), 'on a large portion of that English land which he loved so well, seeing it bask in its most affluent summer beauty, and only bounded by "the inviolate sea." Year after year he trod its two stately terraces with men the most noted of their time, statesmen, warriors, men of letters, science, and art, some of royal race, some famous in far lands, but none more welcome to him than the friends of his youth.'

It would make a very long list to enumerate them. From these two homes came forth the green cloth volumes so eagerly welcomed, two or three years hardly ever passing without a new one. How strange to think of early days, 'the cold-

¹ *Records of Tennyson, Ruskin, and Browning* (London, Macmillan, 1892). See especially p. 52 for a lovely description of an English family scene on a summer day in the garden at Aldworth.

ness
he h
we s
forg
degr
to it
reca
Ard
abun
The
was.
same
and
whic
The
was
loss
hims
is as
cour

a po
enjo
love
enjo
in th

of hi
of m
if h
know
all h
his f
and
wor
with
as ar
to th
wor

I
Qua
pres

ness and even malignity which attended his first efforts, when he had a very few admirers and a host of enemies.¹ How we smile if we happen to unearth one of those long since forgotten critics of the fifties, who traced Tennyson's gradual degradation through *The Princess*, lower still in *In Memoriam*, to its climax of weakness and absurdity in *Maud*! and then recall the long series of the *Idylls of the King*, the *Enoch Arden* volume, the *Ballads and Dramas*, and all the later rich abundance, with *Tiresias*, *Locksley Hall Sixty Years After*, *The Ancient Sage*, and *Vastness*. Progress there certainly was. There is no sign of decay of power. There is the same masculine tone, the same exquisite command of diction and metre, up to the crowning gem of *Crossing the Bar*, with which he enjoined his son to end every edition of the poems. There was, indeed, the natural mellowing of age, but there was no falling off, unless it is to be traced in a certain loss of hopefulness occasionally in the later volumes, not for himself, not for the ultimate triumph of good which he knows is assured, but if at all for the more immediate future of his country in her political and religious outlook.

It was indeed a full and rich life, the very ideal of what a poet's should be. Honour, health, affluence, friends, keenest enjoyment in all the beautiful scenes and sounds in Nature; love of work and capability for work to add a zest to such enjoyment—all these were his, embittered but by one sorrow, in the loss of his son Lionel.

And no one was more fully sensible than the poet himself of his responsibility for it all, no one more alive to the duty of maintaining his life at the highest level. He was nothing if he was not every day improving himself, gaining fresh knowledge in fresh directions, perfecting his art, consecrating all his gifts, which he held as a sacred trust, to the good of his fellow-men. He was utterly free from personal ambition, and had not the slightest spark of vanity. He spoke wise words about the smallness of all earthly fame, and it was with reluctance that he at last consented to accept a peerage as an honour done to literature. And so he lived and wrought to the end, to that October parting in the chamber at Aldworth, when

'The peaceful moonbeams kissed him as he lay

At midnight, dying in the arms of Love.'²

It does not fall within the province of the *Church Quarterly Review*, and much less within the power of the present writer, to attempt an analysis of Tennyson's work, or

¹ Jowett's *Recollections* in ii. 464.

² Sir Lewis Morris.

to treat of the place the poet occupies in the literature of his time and country. But to know what were the religious opinions, and what the attitude towards the science of our day of a thinker of such depth and of such wide influence as the late Poet Laureate, can be a matter of indifference to no Churchman. On these subjects, therefore, we will make some remarks, and proceed to consider first the latter of these two questions.

The first feeling that impresses us about Tennyson's references to scientific truth is that of wonder at his knowledge being always so thoroughly up to date. When he was at Cambridge we are told that in some college debate he astonished his hearers by propounding the theory that 'the development of the human body might possibly be traced from the radiated, vermicular, molluscular, and vertebrate organisms' (i. 44); and *The Palace of Art* (1832) originally contained the following passage, omitted afterwards with other stanzas because the poem was thought to be too full:

'All nature widens upwards. Evermore
The simpler essence lower lies:
More complex is more perfect.'

Here we have an anticipatory expression—a very rudimentary one, of course—of the doctrine which was to revolutionize modern thought, which teaches that the history of living creatures has been a gradual but very slow ascent from the simpler elements to the more complex. The *Origin of Species* was not published till 1859, but though its main thesis as to the different species not being derived from specially created ancestors, but evolved by steps that can be traced, was formulated at first by Darwin, the subject had been for some time, so to speak, in the air. There had been tentative approaches to the solution of the problem, made by the early 'transmutationists,' as they were then called, such as Lamarck, which did not, however, satisfy the naturalists of the time. Now, in such a passage as *In Memoriam* cxviii.—

'They say,
The solid earth whereon we tread
In tracts of fluent heat began,
And grew to seeming-random forms,
The seeming prey of cyclic storms,
Till at the last arose the man.

Move upward, working out the beast,
And let the ape and tiger die'—

we s
Darw
Darw
tion
N
and
(1833
tion
expla
carin
case
his v
P
in A

I
acco
story
the
and
write
cliffs
Broo
by th
extin
that
geolo
colle
of W
H
other
huge
poet
'is s
poem
'the
did n
Whe
is in
for u
(i. 37
belon

we seem almost to be reading a poetical exposition of Darwinism, and yet this was published *nine years* before Darwin's epoch-making volume appeared, and its composition probably goes back to a much earlier date.

No doubt Tennyson had read and pondered over the full and careful abstract given in Lyell's *Principles of Geology* (1833) of Lamarck's work and his theory of the transformation of the ourang-outang into the human species. This may explain other sections of the poem, *e.g.* lv. and lvi., on Nature caring only for the type, or being careless even of that. In any case the poet is seen to be abreast of, or even to have projected his vision beyond, the most advanced thinkers of the age.

Probably the first geological allusion is the amusing simile in *Audley Court* in the description of the pasty,

'Where quail and pigeon, lark and leveret lay
Like fossils of the rock, with golden yolks
Imbedded and injellied.'

In *The Princess* the subject is gracefully touched in the account of the ladies' hammering and clinking, chattering stony names, while in *In Memoriam* (cxxiii.), 'There rolls the deep where grew the tree,' the perpetual disintegration and the reintegration of all things arrests his thought. The writer remembers how, on the return from a walk along the cliffs above Compton Bay, the poet turned with him towards Brook Point, to look at the section of the Wealden, gilded by the setting sun, and said, 'There is what remains of an extinct continent.' He was fond of visiting the pine raft at that spot, and would sometimes spend a large part of the day geologising with the Duke of Argyll; and he had a small collection of fossils from the various formations of the Isle of Wight made for his boys.

He was still more smitten with love for Astronomy, the other of the two terrible shapes 'taller than all the muses and huger than all the mountains' (*Parnassus*). Since Dante no poet has so loved the stars. 'His mind,' said Norman Lockyer, 'is saturated with astronomy' (ii. 381). In an unpublished poem (*circa* 1828) he describes the scenery of the moon, and 'the night all moons' that would be visible from thence. He did not find it difficult to believe in the Infinity of Worlds. Whewell's *Plurality of Worlds* he thought unsatisfactory. It is inconceivable that the whole universe was merely created for us who live in this 'third-rate planet of a third-rate sun' (i. 379). 'According to analogy at least one of the planets belonging to each sun should be inhabited, though perhaps with

beings very different from ourselves' (ii. 336). To the last his interest was undiminished in the spectrum analysis of light, the revelation by photographs of starlight in the inter-stellar spaces hitherto deemed vacant, and in the idea of the all-pervading luminiferous æther. He was greatly pleased by Mr. Procter saying that 'there were no mistakes about the stars in his poems' (ii. 462), and a similar compliment was paid to him by an eminent botanist. Huxley also spoke strongly of the insight into scientific method shown in *In Memoriam*. To illustrate the extent to which he impressed into the service of poetry the grandest images supplied by astronomy, or rather to show how they glided naturally into their place, would transcend the limits of this article. It would be to quote very largely from his works. Among a host of such passages we can but refer to *In Memoriam*, xxiv., lxxxix., and cxxi., to the eclipse in the dedication of *The Idylls*, to the figures in *The Ancient Sage* and *Vastness*, and that grand one of which he says Watts would make a fine picture—

'The face of Death is toward the Sun of Life,
His shadow darkens Earth.'

Admirably equipped, then, as Tennyson was for dealing with such subjects, by observation, by study, and by freest intercourse and discourse with the keenest intellects of this century, what was his general attitude towards the thoughts that have stirred men's minds to their depths during his lifetime, and more particularly during the latter half of it? It is hardly necessary to say that there is no vestige in what he has written of that antagonism between religion and science which is happily now becoming more and more a thing of the past. On the contrary, he did his best to stem the tide of unbelief and agnosticism. He would not shut his eyes to the latest discoveries of physical science, however startling or however perplexing they might be, but neither would he allow them to be deflected for a moment from looking behind and beyond them. Profoundly impressed as he naturally was with the order and beauty of the Universe, saying as he did, on looking closely at the crimson-tipt leaves of a daisy, 'Does not this look like a thinking artificer, one who wishes to ornament?' (i. 313 note), he writes in well-known words—

'That which we dare invoke to bless ;
Our dearest faith ; our ghastliest doubt ;
He, They, One, All ; within, without ;
The Power in darkness whom we guess ;

N
effort
the u
to th
says,
day i
intell
life w
God a
this fa
alone
God i
oursel
that t
lost g
long c
he sa
wretch
higher
TH
devote
mattered
He n
binati
view
deepest
tensity
rages
docility
essence
Tenny
as con
toward
for Te
known
it dom
of this
intense
needs.

Th

'I found Him not in World or Sun,
Or eagle's wing, or insect's eye ;
Nor through the questions men may try,
The petty cobwebs we have spun.'¹

No! It is vain to attempt to apprehend God by any effort of the understanding. It is only through the need of the universal human heart, and through the satisfaction given to that need by Revelation, that we can feel Him. As St. Paul says, 'with the heart man believeth unto righteousness.' One day in his last summer, after one of those moods in which the intellectual problem of sin and pain and apparent waste in life would weigh upon him for a while, he exclaimed, 'Yet God *is* Love, transcendent, all-pervading! We do not get *this* faith from Nature or the world. If we look at Nature alone, full of perfection and imperfection, she tells us that God is disease, murder, and rapine. We get this faith from ourselves, from what is highest within us, which recognizes that there is not one fruitless pang, just as there is not one lost good' (i. 314). And a week before his death he talked long on the Personality and the Love of God. 'I should,' he said, 'infinitely rather feel myself the most miserable wretch on the face of the earth with a God above, than the highest type of man standing alone' (i. 311).

The fourteenth chapter of the first of these volumes is devoted to *In Memoriam*. It contains, among other interesting matter, a valuable communication from Professor Sidgwick. He notes particularly in the poem 'the unparalleled combination of intensity of feeling with comprehensiveness of view and balance of judgment, shown in presenting the *deepest* needs and perplexities of humanity,' and that the intensity of the expression of the feelings, which Atheism outrages and Agnosticism ignores, is accompanied by 'a reverent docility to the teachings of science which also belongs to the essence of the thought of our age.' He further points out that Tennyson is, in this aspect, pre-eminently the poet of science as contrasted with Wordsworth. While Wordsworth's attitude towards nature was one that, so to say, left science unregarded, for Tennyson 'the physical world is always the world as known to us through physical science: the scientific view of it dominates his thoughts about it; and his general acceptance of this view is real and sincere, even when he utters the intensest feeling of its inadequacy to satisfy our deepest needs.'

The few paragraphs on Evolution in vol. i. pp. 322, 323,

¹ *In Memoriam*, cxxiv.

seem, it must be confessed, rather disjointed. Reference is made to the short poem 'By an Evolutionist.' 'The Lord let the house of a brute to the soul of a man.' These lines, if it is not heresy to say so, always appear to us to be the only ones in which Tennyson does not quite reach his habitual perfection of form, and they remind us more of Browning's style. They were written during a dangerous illness in 1888. Surely he has not 'defined his position' here so clearly as elsewhere, e.g. in *Vastness*, *The Ancient Sage*, *The Higher Pantheism*, *De Profundis*, and in much of *In Memoriam*. The poem gives a further reason besides that suggested in *In Memoriam*, xlv., why God should link a piece of divine being to a piece of brute matter, viz. that the soul having conquered the brute element might know that it could live for ever on a higher plane, standing 'on the heights of his life with a glimpse of a height that is higher.' Beyond that the lines seem to us to contain little more than an expansion of the words in the Book of Wisdom (ix. 15), 'The corruptible body presseth down the soul, and the earthly tabernacle weigheth down the mind that museth upon many things.' There follows a detached remark once made to Tyndall, 'No evolutionist is able to explain the mind of Man, or how any possible physiological change of tissue can produce conscious thought.' On the difficulty mentioned above it would seem that he was not acquainted with what Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace has written on this subject.¹ In the last chapter of his valuable work Wallace accepts the spiritual nature of man as not in any way inconsistent with the theory of evolution. He distinguishes at least three stages in the development of the organic world when some new cause or power must (as he proves) necessarily have come into action. They point clearly to an unseen universe—to a world of spirits, to which the world of matter is altogether subordinate. They are (1) the change from inorganic to organic, (2) the introduction of sensation or consciousness, (3) the existence in man of a number of his most characteristic and noblest faculties. And he concludes in these well-weighted sentences:—

'We find that the Darwinian theory, even when carried out to its extreme logical conclusion, not only does not oppose, but lends a decided support to, a belief in the spiritual nature of man. It shows us how man's body may have been developed from that of a lower animal form under the law of natural selection; but it also teaches us that we possess intellectual and moral faculties which could not have been so developed, but must have had another origin, and for

¹ *Darwinism*. London, Macmillan, 1889.

this
univer

EL
Darwi
said to
Christ
It mu
opinio
be pa
decisi
remark
(i. 37).
last bo
at the
Roman
and A
Th
was in

As the
wonder
were fe
Divine
toleran
was im
great C
it. Bo
mother
revolte
her Pr
unbelie
there w
all awa

It i
be con
given u
never
express
this bo
to say
about C
my bel
its pag
VOL.

this origin we can only find an adequate cause in the unseen universe of Spirit.'

Elsewhere (ii. 57) we are told by Lord Tennyson how Darwin called on his father at Farringford, when the latter said to him, 'Your theory of Evolution does not make against Christianity,' to which Darwin answered, 'No, certainly not.' It must be granted at once, in considering the religious opinions of the poet, that naturally a mind like his would not be partial to rigid dogmatic statements. 'That's the swift decision of one who sees only half a truth,' was a characteristic remark he made on some one suddenly pronouncing a dogma (i. 37). He was much impressed with Dr. James Martineau's last book, *The Seat of Authority*, but did not like parts of it: at the same time among his most valued friends were such Roman Catholics as W. G. Ward, Sir John Simeon, Monteith, and Aubrey de Vere.

The spirit in which Tennyson approaches religious subjects was invariably one of the profoundest reverence:

'Let knowledge grow from more to more,
But more of reverence in us dwell.'

As the Duke of Argyll says, 'he was full of a kind of awful wonder, of a silent worship. His direct theological utterances were few. But he did enough to show that he clung to the Divine truths of "the creed of creeds."' Although perfectly tolerant as regarded the doubts and difficulties of his time, he was impatient of any rough or contemptuous treatment of the great Christian verities, and sometimes indignantly rebuked it. Both his reverence and his humility ('the highest virtue, mother of them all,' as he calls it in *The Holy Grail*) were revolted by disdain (ii. 513). And, as the Queen tells us in her *Private Journal*, 'he spoke to her with horror of the unbelievers and philosophers who would make you believe there was no other world, no Immortality, who tried to explain all away in a miserable manner' (ii. 457).

It is very satisfactory when one remembers how it used to be confidently repeated at one time, 'Oh! Tennyson has given up all that!' to be assured in this *Memoir* that he never recanted or retracted his early confession of faith as expressed in numerous passages of *In Memoriam*. It was this book that he used to regard as having said what he had to say on religion. When questions were written to him about Christ he would say, 'Answer for me, that I have given my belief in *In Memoriam*.' Scattered up and down through its pages, as well as elsewhere in his writings, are many deep

VOL. XLV.—NO. XC.

A A

and original words on Faith. The keynote of the whole is that

‘All is well tho’ faith and form
Be sunder’d in the night of fear.’

The opening stanza in the Introduction, speaks of ‘believing where we cannot prove,’ the concluding one in the Poem, of ‘faith that comes of self-control.’ ‘Who knows whether revelation be not itself a veil to hide the glory of that Love which we could not look upon without marring our sight, and our onward progress? If it were proclaimed as a truth, “No man shall perish: all shall live, after a certain time has gone by, in bliss with God,” such a truth might tell well with one or two lofty spirits, but would be the hindrance of the world’ (i. 170). ‘It is hard,’ he says, ‘to believe in God; but it is harder not to believe.’ He once contemplated writing a poem on Spinoza, but would not do so because of his Atheism.¹ The human heart anticipates the final eduction of good out of evil. We trust that error and folly and sin and suffering are good, only misunderstood, and that they serve some purpose yet unknown to us. No doubt he felt deeply ‘the larger hope’ of Universalism, ‘that the whole human race would perhaps through ages of suffering be at length purified and saved,’ but he touches the mystery with becoming reverence; he trusts—he does not presume to say we know.²

Then as to creeds, and forms of faith, how tenderly he cared for others is well illustrated by his remark, ‘Beware of breaking up the soil of any Faith, when you have no better seed to sow’ (ii. 350). He urged men, indeed, to

‘Cleave ever to the sunnier side of doubt,
And cling to faith beyond the forms of faith.’

But yet he has wise words³ on not letting the simple outlines of truth and right become confused by philosophising; and again,⁴ let the man who deems he has reached a higher standpoint, and emancipated himself from the need of formal definitions, beware lest he fail after all for want of the Mary-like type of character; and thus, as the Bishop of Ripon says,

‘he had sympathy with those who feel that faith is larger and nobler than form, and at the same time he had tenderness and appre-

¹ In one of his last talks, however, he said that Spinoza had been misunderstood. See ii. 424.

² Vol. i. p. 322, and cf. *In Memoriam*, liv., lv.

³ *In Memoriam*, liii.

⁴ *Ibid.* xxxiii.

ciati
so m
hum
mak
with
our
infin

form
be f
rate
talks
the s
less,
follo
(ii. 3
feelin

I
of th
frate
wrot
out
denia
comp
appr
was
logue
the p
parti
misu

M
‘The
kiss
we m
Ligh
‘Wha
the l
421).
most
ing b
this g
parts
proof
again
soul.

ciation for those who find their faith helped by form. To him, as to so many, truth is so infinitely great that all we can do with our poor human utterances is to try and clothe it in such language as will make it clear to ourselves, and clear to those to whom God sends us with a message, but meanwhile, above us and our thoughts—above our broken lights—God in His mercy, God in His love, God in His infinite nature is greater than all' (i. 310).

To the last he held this: 'I dread the losing hold of forms. I have expressed this in my *Akbar*. There must be forms, yet I hate the need for so many sects and separate services' (ii. 420). This was said in one of his latest talks. Space does not permit more than a reference to the speech beginning with 'If thou would'st hear the Nameless,' in the opening of the *Ancient Sage* and the ten following pages. We now know from Tennyson himself (ii. 319) that this grand utterance expresses his own personal feelings.

He was haunted at times by the thought of the desolation of that everlasting farewell of Catullus, 'Atque in perpetuum frater ave atque vale,' which prompted the lovely lines he wrote in 1880, at Sirmione, on the Lago di Garda, 'Row us out from Desenzano.' And it was to protest against the denial of faith in God and hope in a life to come that he composed the ghastly piece headed *Despair*, which was misapprehended, and therefore unfavourably criticised. This was from a failure to perceive that it was a dramatic monologue, and a consequent confusion between the opinions of the poet and the mind of the imaginary speaker. He was partial to this form of poem, and it more than once caused a misunderstanding.

Many detached sayings occur in this connexion; e.g., 'The far future has been my world always.' 'Hope is the kiss of the future.' 'Love is the highest we feel, therefore we must believe that God is Love.' 'The life after death, Lightfoot and I agreed, is the cardinal point of Christianity.' 'What matters anything in this world without full faith in the Immortality of the Soul and of Love?' (ii. 343, 353, 421). Such are a few of his briefer sayings on the most profoundly absorbing subject that can occupy a thinking being; while of passages that dwell more expressly on this great theme it is enough to refer to those well-known parts of *In Memoriam*—e.g. Nos. xlv., xlvii., lxxxii.—in proof of his belief in personal individual immortality as against a vague Nirvana, the absorption in the general soul. We must, however, quote some lines in *Locksley Hall*

Sixty Years After, than which few things he ever wrote are finer,

'Truth for truth, and good for good ! The Good, the True, the Pure,
the Just ;
Take the charm " For ever " from them, and they crumble into dust.

'Only That which made us, meant us to be mightier by-and-by,
Set the sphere of all the boundless Heavens within the human eye,

'Sent the shadow of Himself, the boundless, thro' the human soul ;
Boundless inward, in the atom, boundless outward, in the Whole.

'Follow Light, and do the Right—for man can half-control his
doom—

Till you find the deathless Angel seated in the vacant tomb.'

In *Vastness* also, another poem of his later years, the same truth is enforced in different but equally remarkable language.

Huxley and Tennyson, in a conversation not recorded in these volumes, were once discussing Immortality. Huxley said to live *at all* was such an inestimable gain and boon, and so utterly beyond one's deserts and possibility of gratitude, that he was content if one life was all that was granted to him. Tennyson said he felt as if he did not care to live at all if it were not for the hope of immortality and a further cognizance.

'My greatest wish,' he said on another occasion, 'is to have a clearer vision of God.'

We are told that Theology had always a deep interest for Tennyson, and we have seen that it was included in the list of subjects that he prescribed to himself for definite study in early life. We learn also 'that he eagerly read all notable works within his reach relating to the Bible' (i. 308). It must be confessed, however, that we should have welcomed a little more information as to what they were in detail. With much in the *Theological Essays* of Maurice, dedicated to him by his friend, he was in full accord, and the late Precentor of Lincoln, Edmund Venables (an incident not mentioned in this Memoir), once found him reading with great care *Pusey on Daniel*.

The study of Hebrew was a great pleasure to him, and occupied at one period his whole mind and time (ii. 51). He contemplated making a new version of the Book of Job, in prose if not in verse, and was surprised at Jowett's having to admit that he could not read the language. Late in life he went deep into the philosophies of the East, as a preparation for writing his *Akbar's Dream*, and believed that even Chris-

tianity might benefit by incorporating some of their spiritual elements.

'His creed,' he always said, 'he would not formulate, for people would not understand him if he did; but he considered that his poems expressed the principles at the foundation of his faith' (i. 308). His Arthur had loved to dwell on divine truths, and he too finds 'comfort clasped in truth revealed.' The truth of the Incarnation can 'enter in at lowly doors' and 'appeals to all';

'And so the Word had breath and wrought
With human hands the creed of creeds
In loveliness of perfect deeds,
More strong than all poetic thought.'¹

He explained the sense of 'the Word' here to be the same as when used by St. John of the Revelation of the Eternal Thought of the Universe; and so, too, in the Introduction, 'Immortal Love' is intended to be equivalent to the Johannine use of 1 John iv. in the line—

'Strong Son of God, immortal Love,'

where the first word reminds us of the refrain in *The Dream of Gerontius*—

'Sanctus fortis, Sanctus Deus,
De profundis oro Te.'

Never would he allow any flippant remark on Christ to pass unrebuked. We have an instance of this in the fragment given of a conversation with a lady (ii. 97), when X. began to uphold Shelley's views for the regeneration of mankind:

A. T. 'Shelley had not common sense!'

X. 'Well, but had Christ common sense?'

A. T. 'Christ had more common sense than you or I, madam.'

Again he remarked—

'The Rationalists will not easily beat the character of our Lord, that union of man and woman, sweetness and strength' (ii. 69).

A visitor once ventured to ask him, as they were walking in the garden, what he thought of our Saviour. He said nothing at first, then he stopped by a beautiful flower and said—

'What the sun is to that flower Jesus Christ is to my soul. He is the Sun of my soul.'

Other noteworthy sayings on Christ and on the develop-

¹ *In Memoriam*, xxxvi.

ment and final triumph of Christianity—'the Christ that is to be'—about which he was sanguine, will be found given at the close of chapter xiv. in the first volume. 'He disliked discussion on the Nature of Christ, seeing that such discussion was mostly unprofitable, for none knoweth the Son but the Father' (i. 326).

No account of Tennyson in this connexion would be complete which passed over his treatment of prayer and of spiritual insight. With regard to attendance at the public services of the Church, it is well known that the late Laureate was a *parcus deorum cultor*. We will not allude to excuses and extenuations which might be urged in his defence, as we are not of those who hold that genius in this matter is a law to itself, and should be judged by a different standard from other men. We simply note the fact with regret. But it is beyond all question that he was deeply imbued with the essence and spirit of prayer from the first. His son gives us an interesting unfinished prayer composed by him and written out in a boyish hand, and quotes these deep words that he spoke on the subject—

'The reason why men find it hard to regard prayer in the same light in which it was formerly regarded is, that we seem to know more of the unchangeableness of Law: but I believe that God reveals Himself in each individual soul. Prayer is, to take a mundane simile, like opening a sluice between the great ocean and our little channels when the great sea gathers itself together and flows in at full tide' (i. 324).

He also gives a few of the chief references to it in his poetry, though not the beautiful passage in *Enoch Arden*—

'He was not all unhappy. His resolve
Upbore him, and firm faith, and evermore
Prayer from a living source within the will,
And beating up thro' all the bitter world,
Like fountains of sweet water in the sea,
Kept him a living soul.'

The introductory poem to *In Memoriam* is a solemn prayer, as are also its concluding stanzas. His niece Miss Weld, among other touching recollections of her uncle,¹ says that he told her shortly before his death that no earnest prayer of his failed to receive an answer. She also mentions how he often dwelt in his talks upon the special nearness of Christ to him in the Holy Communion. And here we may refer to what his son has recorded of the only sense in which

¹ *Contemporary Review*, November 1897.

he s
into

This
and
sacri
certa
that
we p
we n
and
food

I
his c
hum
shru
was
be h
once
the
and
finel
spiri
Tenn
insp
fami
quot
or o

'are
Eng
and
the
grev

he said he could partake of it, quoting his own words put into Cranmer's mouth from *Queen Mary* :

'It is but a communion, not a mass,
No sacrifice, but a life-giving feast.'

This appears at first sight to be a somewhat crude statement ; and if the poet's intention was to deny the existence of any sacrificial element in the Holy Communion, exception might certainly be taken to the language. If, however, he meant that there has never been but one true perfect Sacrifice, which we plead and present in each Eucharistic celebration, then we need not trace in the words a denial of Christ's Presence ; and 'a life-giving feast' will be the equivalent to 'our spiritual food and sustenance' in the First Exhortation.

If Tennyson had written nothing but the *Holy Grail*, his devoutness, his reverence for holy things, and his intense humility would have been abundantly manifest. He had shrunk at first from dealing with anything so sacred when it was suggested by Macaulay. He doubted whether it could be handled without incurring the charge of irreverence. He once composed but never wrote down a *Lancelot's Quest of the Grail*, but the subject was abandoned for many years, and not resumed till 1869. Never has the truth been so finely expressed that only by the spiritually-minded can spiritual things be discerned, at least since Dante. Lord Tennyson dwells on the rapt look of the poet and the inspired way in which he chanted parts of the poem to his family as they were composed. We cannot forbear from quoting the magnificent conclusion on 'visions of the night or of the day' in the King's speech :

'Many a time they come,
Until this earth he walks on seems not earth,
This light that strikes his eyeball is not light,
This air that smites his forehead is not air
But vision—yea, his very hand and foot—
In moments when he feels he cannot die,
And knows himself no vision to himself,
Nor the high God a vision, nor that One
Who rose again : ye have seen what ye have seen.'

These three lines 'In moments,' &c., their author said, 'are the (spiritually) central lines of the *Idylls*. The general English view of God is as of an immeasurable clergyman ; and some mistake the devil for God' (ii. 90). It was after the publication of the *Holy Grail* that his fame in America grew with extraordinary rapidity.

Akin to spiritual insight is spiritual communion.¹ Can souls on earth and in the other world mutually speak to each other? And can two souls separated from each other on earth touch each other through a finer medium in spite of distance in the body? There are words in *Aylmer's Field* which imply that the latter may take place:

'Star to star vibrates light : may soul to soul
Strike through a finer element of her own?
So—from afar, touch as at once?'

Again and again he answers the former question by a strong affirmative, basing his belief on what is possible to intensity of thought and unconsciousness of body. The grandest passages are *In Memoriam* xciii. and the poem that follows it.

'How pure at heart and sound in head,
With what divine affections bold
Should be the man whose thought would hold
An hour's communion with the dead.

'In vain shalt thou, or any, call
The spirits from their golden day,
Except, like them, thou too canst say,
My spirit is at peace with all.

'They haunt the silence of the breast,
Imaginations calm and fair,
The memory like a cloudless air,
The conscience as a sea at rest:

'But when the heart is full of din,
And doubt beside the portal waits,
They can but listen at the gates,
And hear the household jar within.'

In these noble words he seems to penetrate into the inner world, to give us a fresh power to grasp its secrets and realise its conditions, to flash a new light upon the great Christian Article of the Communion of Saints.

If, then, we inquire what has been Tennyson's special contribution to religious thought, we find that it does not lie in any fresh exposition of metaphysical or theological subtleties which would have been uncongenial to him, though more attractive to a mind like that of Browning. He knew well that the Finite can by no means grasp the Infinite. It was in the spirit of an old saint or mystic (as Jowett said), and not of a rationalist, that he habitually thought and felt

¹ Cf. Tennyson, *His Art and Relation to Modern Life*, p. 438, by Stopford A. Brooke, London, 1894.

about
spoke

and t

What
certain
quisit
belief
depth
their
being
to ove
solem
and p
ephen
aspect
as we
come.
men a
mode
distr
repose
creatu
elevat
tion,
the sa
of dai
which
the ea
seer,
intelle
will n
At
honou

and i
Memo
sands,
to the
that v

about the Nature of Christ. And so on free-will no one has spoken more powerfully, though most simply; as in

'O living Will that shall endure,' &c.

and the twenty lines beginning—

'Oh, well for him whose will is strong.'

What we gain from him is the reiteration and enforcement of certain fundamental and central beliefs, enshrined in that exquisite choice of pure English of which he was such a master—beliefs and truths that seem to be ever welling up from the depths of his consciousness, and from life-long experience of their vital importance to have become a part of his very being. This is, indeed, a boon which it is scarcely possible to overestimate in an age when nothing has been thought too solemn or too sacred to be called in question, and canvassed and pronounced upon in almost oracular language, by the ephemeral literature of the magazine or newspaper. In this aspect Tennyson must be regarded as a true *Vates*—prophet as well as poet—to his generation, and to those that are to come. For again and again we believe that in the future, men and women jaded with the toil and hurry incident to modern civilization, stunned and perplexed by the many distracting voices around them, will return for calm and repose to those serene galleries peopled with the stately creatures of his imagination, and vocal with utterances full of elevated thought—a constant source of strength and consolation, of inspiration and joy, to uplift from this earth, and at the same time to nerve for the more strenuous performance of daily duty. His words, not given in these volumes, but which he is recorded elsewhere¹ to have said, should ring in the ears of the coming generation like those of an old Hebrew seer, 'I tell you the nation without faith is doomed; mere intellectual life—however advanced or however perfected—will not fill the void.'

At the last scene in the funeral at the Abbey the love and honour in which he was held was evidenced by

'A people's voice,

The proof and echo of all human fame';

and it was very touching on that occasion to see how *In Memoriam*, the book that has ministered support to thousands, the book which the Queen in 1862 told him had next to the Bible been her comfort, was being read by so many in that vast multitude, while waiting for the service.

¹ *Quarterly Review*, October 1897.

In December 1888, when the poet was suffering from a serious attack of rheumatic gout, and his life was almost despaired of, the late Lady Tennyson received from Jowett a letter, containing the following sentences:—

‘I would have him think sometimes that no one has done more for mankind in our own time, having found expression for their noblest thoughts and having never written a line that he would wish to blot; and that this benefit, which he has conferred on the English language and people, will be an everlasting possession to them, as great as any poet has ever given to any nation, and that those who have been his friends will always think of him with love and admiration, and speak to others of the honour of having known him. He who has such record of life should have the comfort of it in the late years of it: there may be some things which he blames, and some which he laments, but as a whole he has led a true and noble life, and he need not trouble himself about small matters. He may be thankful for the great gift which he has received, and that he can return an account of it. It seems to me that he may naturally dwell on such thoughts at this time, although also, like a Christian, feeling that he is an unprofitable servant, and that he trusts only in the mercy of God’ (ii. 350).

We would willingly linger over Tennyson’s private life as presented to us in these volumes, but it is only possible to allude briefly to its singular charm, and to the many admirable features in his character. ‘Loveableness,’ as Palgrave says, ‘was its dominant note.’ His large-hearted and generous nature was shown in his criticism of others, and his hearty enjoyment of good work done, whoever was the author, and however much the tone of his mind might differ from his own. It was seen also in his attitude towards any great public movement, such, for instance, as the scheme for the ‘Gordon Boys’ Home,’ in which he took the keenest interest. There was a child-like simplicity about him, joined to a luminous insight into character and humanity. He loved to visit poor old men and talk to them of a future life. His idea of heaven, he once said, was the perpetual ministry of one soul to another. The home at Farringford, it was observed, was marked by an ‘apartness’ and unworldliness. At the same time there was a marvellous receptivity about him. He was always taking in new developments of knowledge, even to the last, so that his conversation was an epitome of all that was best worth knowing at the time. As Carlyle said, ‘Alfred always from the beginning took a grip at the right side of every question’ (ii. 241). All who ever heard Tennyson talk will testify to the correctness of what his son records of the impressiveness of his language and his presence.

‘His
the po
(ii. 34)
words
must
quote

‘A
Mrs.
memor
voice a
poem
subord
On th
sions
was d
of goo

Hi
hausti
were r
degen
thorou
decla
world
anecd
article
utter v
for the
laugh
amusi
turned

‘I
general
Dante
have be
in the

On
change
politic
Aubre
self a
conser
to the
Home
believ

'His dignity and repose of manner, his low musical voice, and the power of his magnetic dark eye kept the attention riveted' (ii. 348). Very remarkable was his truth-loving precision of words and his horror of all inaccuracy. He was sensitive, it must be admitted, to criticism, but how often was he misquoted and misunderstood!

'Amongst the experiences of intercourse with him, nothing,' as Mrs. Ritchie says, in her interesting *Recollections*, 'was more memorable than to hear him read his poetry. The roll of his great voice acted sometimes like an incantation, so that when it was a new poem he was reading, the power of realizing its actual nature was subordinated to wonder at the sound of the tones' (ii. 87).

On these occasions he did not scruple to interpose expressions of admiration, such as, 'That's fine, isn't it?' But it was done with delightful *naïveté* and came from sheer love of good workmanship.

His powerful memory supplied him with an almost inexhaustible fund of anecdotes, and he told them well. They were not confined to mere laughable stories, and they never degenerated into vulgar gossip or scandal, for which he felt a thorough contempt. He is said once to have playfully declared that he believed every crime and every vice in the world were connected with the passion for autographs and anecdotes and records of great men.¹ The writer of this article remembers how almost the first words he heard him utter were on this subject. 'Autographs! I should not care for the autograph of Adam, dated Eden, day one!' His very laugh was unlike that of others. He laughed himself over amusing passages in *The Churchwarden and the Curate* as he turned them off.

'I dare not tell how high I rate humour,' he wrote, 'which is generally most fruitful in the highest and most solemn human spirits. Dante is full of it, Shakespeare, Cervantes, and almost all the greatest have been pregnant with this glorious power. You will find it even in the Gospel of Christ' (i. 167).

On his love of his country and his dread of precipitate changes our limitations prevent us from dwelling. His political opinions he once summed up shortly in an answer to Aubrey de Vere, when he asked him whether he called himself a Conservative. 'I believe in progress, and I would conserve the hopes of man.' It is hardly necessary to refer to the well-known words 'I love Gladstone, but I hate his Home Rule policy.' To Mr. Bosworth Smith he wrote: 'I believe that the Disestablishment and the Disendowment of

¹ *Autobiography of Sir Henry Taylor*, ii. 193.

the Church would prelude the downfall of much that is greatest and best in England. Abuses there are, no doubt, in the Church, as elsewhere, but these are not past remedy' (ii. 315).

He is gone far from our human praise. But he has left the England which he so profoundly loved a rich heritage of wisdom which she will do well to treasure. And should evil days ever come, such as he sometimes feared were in store for us, from cynical indifference and the materialistic tendencies of his time, his words should stir the national pulse and rekindle the flame of true patriotism, the love of true freedom. No such voice will be heard again in our days or in those of our sons. The line of Homer¹ that has been so well applied to one of the finest—some think the very finest—of his early poems may be said of the poet himself:

'Thou shall find no other Odysseus come hither any more.'

No other Tennyson shall arise in our land. The world moves on so rapidly that it is impossible to forecast even for a few decades what the colour and character of the twentieth century will be. But everything points to change, and possibly there may even be fundamental discoveries in science, so vast as to transform our modern life beyond the dreams of the most sanguine Evolutionist. The coming age may have its own interpreter, its spokesman, its prophet. Some have thought that the poet of the future will find his sphere in the teeming life of our great cities. But he will not be cast in the mould which fashioned Alfred Tennyson. The classic spirit will probably have less and less attraction for each succeeding generation; the sensibilities to literary grace, wrought up to exquisite form as it was by him, will become weaker, and certainly do not keep pace with the advance made in the scientific and material world. And then, again, the field is so immense, and the specialization of subjects so minute, that it will be scarcely possible for any single mind to sum them up and give them adequate expression. Let us freely acknowledge our debt of gratitude to one who has given such pure delight to thousands of his fellow-countrymen, who has nerved many a feeble heart in an age of scepticism and doubt, who has brought light and comfort into many darkened homes, and shed a fresh glory upon our native language; and let us thank God for this signal manifestation in our times of lofty genius, enshrined in a life that was noble, consistent, and unspoil by prosperity.

¹ Οὐ μὲν γάρ τοι ἕρ' ἄλλος ἐλεύσεται ἐνθάδ' Ὀδυσσεύς.—*Od.* xvi. 204.

ART.

1. *Wh*
rea
of
Pu
Ca
2. *The*
Sc
D.
(L
3. *The*
Ha
Ch
De
Ma
Ma
Ma
Au
Sc
Th
Pa
Li
A)

THE m
which v
the rela
In cons
we sho
Church
the doc
by a m
while a
who ta
objectiv
matters
Dr. Pu
from N
doctrin
with gr
influen
known.

ART. VI.—THE RELATION OF CONFIRMATION TO BAPTISM.

1. *What is the Distinctive Grace of Confirmation ?* A Paper read before the Chapter of the South-Eastern Division of the Upper Llandaff Rural Deanery. By F. W. PULLER, B.A., Vicar of Roath. (London, Oxford, and Cambridge, 1880.)
2. *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism as Taught in Holy Scripture and the Fathers.* By ARTHUR JAMES MASON, D.D., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (London and New York, 1891.)
3. *The Doctrine of Confirmation considered in Relation to Holy Baptism as a Sacramental Ordinance of the Catholic Church ; with a Preliminary Historical Survey of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.* By A. THEODORE WIRGMAN, B.D., D.C.L., late Foundation Scholar of St. Mary Magdalene College, Cambridge, and Vice-Provost of St. Mary's Collegiate Church, Port Elizabeth, South Africa ; Author of *The Prayer Book, with Historical Notes and Scripture Proofs ; The Beatitudes and the Lord's Prayer ; The English Reformation and the Book of Common Prayer ; The Church and the Civil Power ; The Spirit of Liberty ; The English Church and People in South Africa*, &c. (London, New York, and Bombay, 1897.)

THE main subject of each of the three books the names of which we have prefixed to this article is, as their titles imply, the relation of Holy Baptism and Confirmation to one another. In considering this important matter it may be convenient that we should give a brief history of recent opinion about it in the Church of England. At the beginning of the present century the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration was probably held only by a minority of clergy and by a smaller proportion of laity, while among these it is not likely there was any large number who taught or believed that in Confirmation there is a real objective gift of God the Holy Ghost. In this, as in other matters, the Oxford Movement brought a great change. In Dr. Pusey's treatise on Baptism, an elaborate work expanded from Nos. 67, 68, and 69 of the *Tracts for the Times*, the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration was taught and defended with great emphasis, power, and learning ; and wherever the influence of the Tractarians extended this truth was made known. Less attention was paid to the doctrine of Confirma-

tion than to that of Baptism, and there was no very careful investigation of their relation to one another; but the general outcome of the Tractarian theology in this respect was a belief that in Baptism the personal indwelling of God the Holy Ghost was communicated to the soul, and that in Confirmation there was not so much the gift of a Presence not hitherto possessed as a fresh outpouring in order to bestow special graces of Him who already in Baptism had made the Christian soul His temple. For such a position, as Scriptural and Patristic, there was the authority of Dr. Pusey himself, who, in writing on 'the close connexion of Confirmation with Baptism,' had said—

'It is plain . . . that those passages of the Fathers which speak of the gift of the Spirit as belonging peculiarly to Confirmation are to be understood (as indeed their words convey) of an especial and confirming grace (which our Church holds), not as though Baptism conferred simply remission of sins and the gift of the Spirit were altogether reserved for Confirmation, both because they hold Baptism to be "the birth of water and the spirit," and themselves repeatedly affirm the Spirit to be given in Baptism.'

In the year 1880 a new departure² was taken by the publication of a small but learned treatise by the Rev. F. W. Puller, then Vicar of Roath, entitled *What is the Distinctive Grace of Confirmation?* In this essay, after identifying Confirmation with the action of St. Peter and St. John at Samaria,³ and of St. Paul at Ephesus,⁴ and pointing out the 'utter baselessness' of the 'popular view of Confirmation in England' that 'children are to come to Confirmation for the one purpose of taking on themselves and consciously renewing the vows made in their name by their sponsors at their Baptism,' and noticing the description in Holy Scripture of the 'grace of Confirmation' as the 'imparting of the gift of the Holy Ghost,' Father Puller went on to put a clear alternative as to the meaning of this Scriptural language.

'Are we to understand . . . that this "reception or partaking of

¹ Pusey, *Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism*, being Nos. 67, 68, and 69 of *Tracts for the Times*, p. 154, fourth edition.

² It is not meant that the opinion which Father Puller advocated had not been previously taught by any in the Church of England during the present century. In the preface to Dr. Mason's *Relation of Confirmation to Baptism* it is mentioned that the late Mr. John Frere pleaded for it in his *The Doctrine of Imposition of Hands*, published in 1845; and Father Puller referred to the views expressed by the late Mr. George Hay Forbes in the *Panoply*. But little attention seems to have been given to this opinion until the publication of Father Puller's essay.

³ Acts viii. 14-17.

⁴ Acts xix. 1-7.

the H
in Ba
measu
tized
Confir
which
Ghost
regene
Presen

Fa
accep
he arg
tween
'recei
stanti
had be
of the
God, a
natura
would
not al
the 'E
of the
in the
Apost
as a g
and in
a new
place,
were c
advoca
birth o
with t
Confir
and bi
of the
of the
appeal
primit
his ar
positio
Baptis

¹ Pu

² Ib

⁴ Ib

the Holy Ghost" merely means the increase of a gift already imparted in Baptism; so that through Confirmation is poured forth, in a fuller measure, that same indwelling Presence of the Spirit which the baptized Christian already possesses? Or are we to understand that Confirmation sets up in the soul a new relation to the Holy Ghost, which it had not before; so that, although in Baptism the Holy Ghost operates and works on the soul by His purifying, consecrating, regenerating influence, yet that He does not impart His indwelling Presence until He is given in a new way by the laying on of hands?¹

Father Puller then proceeded to give three reasons for accepting the second of these alternatives. In the first place he argued that the Pentecostal gift set up a 'new relation between the Holy Ghost and the souls of those who' then 'received Him,' that 'the Apostles' then 'received the substantial indwelling of the Holy Ghost,' and that since they had before Pentecost received the 'privileges' of 'the cleansing of the soul, the being made members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven,' we should naturally expect that 'subsequent converts to Christianity' would be 'admitted into the privileges of the new covenant, not all at once, but by at least two stages,' corresponding to the 'Paschal stage' and the 'Pentecostal stage' in the case of the Apostles.² Secondly, he contended that the narratives in the eighth and nineteenth chapters of the Acts of the Apostles speak of the indwelling Presence of the Holy Spirit as a gift which was received after Baptism at Confirmation, and imply that this was a gift of a new kind and not merely a new activity of a Presence already possessed.³ In the third place, passages from the Fathers, stated to be representative, were quoted to support the alternative which Father Puller advocated.⁴ Further, a comparison was added between 'our birth of water and the Spirit in Baptism' and 'our anointing with the personal indwelling of the same blessed Spirit in Confirmation' on the one hand and our Lord's 'conception and birth of the Holy Ghost and Mary' and 'His reception of the substantial inhabitation of the Comforter on the banks of the Jordan' on the other hand.⁵ The essay ended with an appeal for a restoration in the Church of England of the primitive practice of Infant Confirmation.⁶ In the course of his argument Father Puller stated somewhat exactly his position on the subject of the relation of Confirmation to Baptism:

¹ Puller, *What is the Distinctive Grace of Confirmation?* pp. 11-12.

² *Ibid.* pp. 12-20.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 20-4.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 26-9.

⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 30-2.

⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 36-9.

'In Baptism the Holy Ghost pours down gifts of grace, which, as coming from Him, may be called gifts of the Spirit; but in Confirmation He imparts, not merely gifts of grace, but Himself. In Baptism the Holy Ghost re-fashions the person, whom He is regenerating, into a holy temple, meet to be the dwelling-place of God; and then, in Confirmation, the Shechinah, the tabernacling presence of God's glory, comes to take possession of the shrine which has been prepared for Him. The temple built by Zerubbabel was a temple of God, although the indwelling Presence over the Ark was not vouchsafed to it: but it was only when the Desire of all nations came and filled His house with glory that the glory of the latter house became greater than that of the former (Hag. ii. 7, 9). In Baptism the grace of the Holy Ghost comes down as the incorruptible seed from the everlasting Father, to fecundate the laver of regeneration, which is the womb of the Church, so that those who are being joined to Christ may "become the sons of God, and be born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (St. John i. 12, 13). But in Confirmation, by the Spirit's Personal Advent and indwelling, the regenerated soul is anointed with the divine Unguent, and is admitted to a certain share in the priesthood of the Messiah, and is marked out as destined in the future to participate in His royalty.'¹

In the year 1888, on the publication of the *Faith of the Gospel*, Dr. Mason committed himself to the same position about the relation of the gifts conferred in Baptism to those conferred in Confirmation, and illustrated by referring to the Eucharist and the commission of Christ the strength of his conviction that Baptism and Confirmation form one Sacrament only:

'Confirmation ought not to be regarded as a separate Sacrament, but as the second part of the one Sacrament of Baptism. It is only a separate Sacrament in the same kind of way as the Eucharistic Chalice might be called a separate Sacrament from the Eucharistic Bread. Christ Himself instituted it, when He said "Make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" (St. Matt. xxviii. 19). Only part of the baptismal grace is bestowed, when the baptized stops short of Confirmation. . . . All operations of Christ in His Church are performed though the Holy Ghost, and assuredly the act by which we are made a "new creation" is no exception. But to be born of the Spirit is not the same thing as to receive the Spirit. Baptism is related to Confirmation as the breathing of our Lord upon His disciples on the evening of His resurrection was related to the outpouring of Pentecost. . . . Strict theology, following the language of Scripture, connects such terms as giving, and receiving, and having the Spirit, the Spirit falling on a man, and dwelling in him, and making him His temple, and being shed abroad in his

¹ Puller, *ubi sup.* p. 25.

heart,
tism
life b
rudim
power
subje
baptiz
the S
selves
whose
did n
later.'

T
the F
and v
tion i
public
eviden
tains
teach
argum
Puller
with
and a
Infan

'I
concer
but I
be ind
the Gi
powers
rity is.
the Ba
mation
at the
most c
souls
taking
Spirit's
not un
wanted
brated
Gregor
ponem

¹ M
a slight

² M
VOL

heart, sealing, and anointing him, with Confirmation, not with Baptism by itself. We are quickened into new and eternal and Divine life by the first act which ushers us into the Body of Christ; the rudiments of new faculties are imparted to us, which are called "the powers of the world to come" (Heb. vi. 5); we begin at once to be subject to heavenly motions from the Holy Ghost, such as the unbaptized cannot be said to experience; but not immediately does the Spirit of Christ take possession of us and flood our inward selves with His penetrating presence. Even Christ Himself, whose Nativity in some degree corresponded to our regeneration, did not receive the complete unction of the Spirit till many years later.¹

The opinions on this subject expressed by Dr. Mason in the *Faith of the Gospel* were defended by him at great length and with much learning in his work *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism as taught in Holy Scripture and the Fathers*, published in 1891. This book treats of the Scriptural evidence and of general theological considerations. It contains a very valuable collection and discussion of Patristic teaching. It may be observed that, while the general line of argument and the main conclusions resemble those of Father Puller's essay, Dr. Mason differs from him to a certain extent with regard to the state in relation to Baptism of the Apostles² and altogether as to the desirability of the restoration of Infant Confirmation. On the latter point he says:

'It may seem to be required of me that I should say something concerning the age at which Confirmation should be administered; but I do so with much hesitation. If the gift given in Confirmation be indeed, as all antiquity goes to prove, the personal indwelling of the Giver Himself, and not merely a specific power or group of powers, then infancy is doubtless as capable of receiving it as maturity is. So far as I am aware, there is no trace in ancient days of the Baptism of little children which was not followed up by Confirmation either at the time, or, in case of Baptism hastened by danger, at the earliest possible opportunity. But, on the other hand, the most characteristic purposes for which the Holy Ghost enters into souls appear to be chiefly connected with full age, and with the taking of the appointed station in the Christian polity. Many of the Spirit's gifts would be of little use to the babe. It seems, therefore, not unreasonable to defer the bestowal of them till they are actually wanted. . . . If the two parts of the Sacrament must needs be celebrated at once, I would shelter myself under the authority of St. Gregory the Divine (*Orat.* xl. p. 658), and advise rather the postponement of Baptism, as a rule, till the years of discretion (using

¹ Mason, *Faith of the Gospel* pp. 298-300, third edition. There was a slight verbal difference in the first edition.

² Mason, *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, pp. 467-70.

that expression in its strict sense), than the administration of Confirmation, as a rule, to infants.¹

And to the 'Bishop Paddock Lectures' for 1890, published under the title *God Incarnate*, Bishop Kingdon added a learned and able note on the subject of Confirmation from the point of view of those who hold that the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit is not communicated to the soul at Baptism.²

The opinion thus ably advocated by Father Puller and Dr. Mason and Bishop Kingdon has, we understand, met with wide and increasing acceptance in the Church of England. It has been the cause, too, of a good deal of perplexity and uncertainty, while by some it has been strongly condemned. A theologian so competent to deal with the whole subject as Dr. Bright has spoken on it with clearness and emphasis. Referring to St. Paul's teaching about Baptism, he says :

'Whatever special gift of "power" was to be bestowed through the laying on of Apostolic hands,—through the rite which is now so appropriately described as Confirmation,—the effects assigned to the regenerating Sacrament are such as to involve a true presence of that Holy Spirit to whose agency, in the text, the sealing is attributed. It is hard to see how the recipient of Baptism as such could be a child of God, yet destitute of that "assurance of sonship" which comes from the Spirit of adoption; could be "in" Christ, yet not "in" the Holy Spirit; could be incorporated into the body mystical, yet not really "inhabited" by the "Giver of life," who is the very informing and vitalising principle of that body. Such incoherences and anomalies, involved in a theory which would restrict His indwelling to Confirmation, should deter a consistent believer in Baptismal regeneration from adopting it.'³

Archdeacon Hutchings, too, writing with the authority of one who has made the doctrine of the Holy Spirit a special study, said many years ago that 'by means of' Baptism, 'when duly administered and received, the soul becomes the Temple of the Holy Spirit';⁴ and has recently repeated more fully the same belief :

'In Confirmation the Holy Spirit is given. The Apostles did not go down to Samaria to perform "a mere ceremony," but to administer the "sacramental complement" of Baptism. But we must be careful, whilst we affirm that the Holy Spirit is given in Confirmation, not to forget that in Baptism the same Spirit has already made the soul His Temple. We must not obscure the effects of the greater in commending the less. . . . The qualification to receive

¹ Mason, *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, p. 480, note.

² These lectures are published by Thomas Whittaker, New York. The note referred to is on pp. 235-51; cf. p. 200.

³ Bright, *Morality in Doctrine*, pp. 90-2.

⁴ Hutchings, *The Person and Work of the Holy Ghost*, p. 171.

"the
gift of
Holy

I

Wing

Port

discu

avow

of G

wheth

Confi

the H

A

Decer

this q

any o

descri

Churc

made

sins ;

he we

'N

You r

sugges

Baptis

speaki

against

way of

what y

chief p

but ag

blood,

may w

Ghost

charact

'B

For co

divine,

cannot

From

relation

Christ,

cannot

¹ Hu

² TH

delivere

in the C

"the Plenitude of the Holy Spirit" is the possession already of the gift of the Spirit. In Confirmation there is a second largess of the Holy Spirit, the "complement" of the Baptismal Gift.¹

In his work entitled *The Doctrine of Confirmation*, Dr. Wirgman, the Vice-Provost of St. Mary's Collegiate Church, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, has published an elaborate discussion of the Scriptural and Patristic evidence with the avowed intention of maintaining that the personal indwelling of God the Holy Ghost is the possession of the baptized, whether confirmed or unconfirmed, and that the work of Confirmation is, not to set up a new relation of the soul to the Holy Spirit, but to confer special gifts.

And in a lecture delivered in Westminster Abbey on December 18, 1897, Canon Gore made a brief reference to this question, and adopted a somewhat different position from any of those which we have hitherto mentioned. Thus, after describing the teaching of the New Testament and the early Church as being that 'in Baptism we are regenerated and made new men in Christ, and receive the forgiveness of our sins; in Confirmation we receive the gift of the Holy Ghost,' he went on to say:

'Notice, you cannot draw a sharp line between the sacraments. You may find a spiritual writer, even the author of The Acts, suggesting that we do not receive the gift of the Holy Ghost in Baptism; but remember this—there is sometimes a certain way of speaking in the Bible, as when St. Paul says, "We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers"—a way of speaking by which you use a negative in order to emphasize what you are not at that moment speaking of, or what is not the chief point to be considered. We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against unseen hosts; meaning that it was not the flesh and blood, visible enemies, which he thought most important. So it may well be that spiritual writers say we receive the gift of the Holy Ghost not in Baptism, but in Confirmation—meaning that is not the characteristic gift of Baptism.

'But you cannot draw a line between the different sacraments. For consider it: they are all one gift of love and grace, one and divine, all ministered by the same Spirit in different stages. You cannot exactly say where the one gift stops and the other begins. From the time we are baptized all are certainly in a continuous relation to the Holy Spirit, through Whom we are made members of Christ, children of God, and heirs of the Kingdom of Heaven. You cannot draw an exact line between Baptism and Confirmation.'²

¹ Hutchings, *Gleanings, Spiritual, Doctrinal, and Practical*, p. 201.

² The lecture referred to was the last of a course of three lectures delivered on the Saturday afternoons in Advent. They were reported in the *Church Times* of December 10, 17, 23, 1897.

We have on several occasions in the past reviewed books dealing with this subject, pointed out some of their merits and weaknesses, and given special attention to the practical questions which are closely connected with the doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation.¹ The publication of Dr. Wirgman's work affords us an opportunity of recurring to the controversy and placing before our readers in a summarized form the chief arguments by which each opinion has been supported and the evidence upon which they rest.

It is unquestionable that the New Testament represents that gifts of the Holy Spirit are bestowed in Confirmation. The work of St. Peter and St. John in Samaria is described in the words 'Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost.'² Of St. Paul at Ephesus it is said 'When Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them.'³

When this fixed point is established, two questions present themselves. The first question is whether the grace thus given in Confirmation is that merely of gifts of the Holy Spirit or that of the personal indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit Himself. The second question is whether, if the Confirmation grace is the personal indwelling presence, Confirmation is the first occasion upon which it is received.

Dr. Wirgman maintains that the grace mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles as given in Confirmation at Samaria and Ephesus was not the personal indwelling presence, but certain gifts and operations. He bases his opinion on the grammatical argument that in Acts viii. 17 and xix. 2, the phrase *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, Holy Spirit, is used without the article, and that when so used it always denotes, not the objective personal indwelling, but operations or manifestations or gifts. Met by the fact that in Acts viii. 18 and xix. 6, the article is used in the phrase *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*, the Holy Spirit, he explains this by saying that the article is there added to denote 'renewed mention of the same thing and is equivalent to the *aforesaid* gift of Holy Spirit' (p. 61).

Now, we cannot accept as completely satisfactory the theory of a clear-cut and invariable distinction between *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, Holy Spirit, and *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*, the Holy Spirit, which is adopted by many very able scholars and critics, and is here used by Dr. Wirgman. It is very difficult

¹ See the articles entitled 'Confirmation' (October 1880); 'The Age for Confirmation' (October 1886); 'Primitive Teaching on Confirmation and its Relation to Holy Baptism' (April 1892).

² Acts viii. 17.

³ Acts xix. 6.

to su
has
Spiri
or th
i. 8 c
if the
Holy
to de
Tem
Lord
by St
cost.
excep
Wirg
17-1
we de
than
receiv
of Hi
from
the s
was r
It
Confir
also K
fident
of the
'In
of the
they m
resist t
If,
Himse
second
is the
indwe
He co
one w
questi
'St
'Ac
'Ca
animos
in spirit
quant:

to suppose that in St. Luke ii. 25, πνεῦμα ἅγιον, Holy Spirit, has a different meaning from τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, the Holy Spirit, and τὸ πνεῦμα, the Spirit, in the two following verses, or that there is a like difference between Acts i. 5 and Acts i. 8 or the two parts of Acts ii. 4. It is not easy to see why, if the form without the article denotes the operation of the Holy Spirit without His personal indwelling, it should be used to describe His presence within our Lord at the time of the Temptation,¹ and His influence in the teaching office of our Lord's holy Manhood,² and by our Lord Himself,³ as well as by St. Luke,⁴ for the work of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost. But even if this distinction should be less without exception than we believe it to be, we could not accept Dr. Wirgman's explanation of the use of both phrases in Acts viii. 17-18 and xix. 2, 6. If the distinction is to be maintained, we do not see how these passages can mean anything else than that those who were confirmed at Samaria and Ephesus received both the gifts of the Holy Spirit and also the grace of His personal indwelling. And, on the other hand, apart from such a distinction, the obvious meaning of the words of the sacred writer is that it was the Holy Spirit Himself who was received.

It may, then, we think, be taken as established that in Confirmation the Holy Spirit imparts not only His gifts but also His personal indwelling presence, and that we may confidently accept such statements as that in which the Catechism of the Council of Trent teaches :

'In this Sacrament the Holy Spirit pours Himself into the minds of the faithful and increases in them strength and fortitude so that they may be able to fight manfully in the spiritual contest and to resist their most wicked foes.'⁵

If, then, in Confirmation God the Holy Ghost 'pours Himself' into the person confirmed, we have to consider the second question which we mentioned : namely, whether this is the first occasion of the communication of His personal indwelling presence. We may put aside an argument that He could not 'pour Himself,' as distinct from His gifts, into one who had already received Him, and that therefore this question needs no consideration. We may not so on *a priori*

¹ St. Luke iv. 1.

² St. Luke iv. 18.

³ Acts i. 5.

⁴ Acts ii. 4.

⁵ *Cat. Conc. Trid.* II. iii. 23, 'Hoc sacramento Spiritus Sanctus in animos fidelium sese infundit, in eisque robur et fortitudinem auget, ut in spiritali certamine viriliter pugnare, et nequissimis hostibus resistere queant.'

grounds dogmatize on the things of God. Of the deep mysteries of the varying degrees of the Presence of God and the possible methods of His coming where He has already been, we can only speak under the guidance of authority.

The chief Scriptural argument in support of the opinion which has been advocated by Father Puller and Dr. Mason is based upon St. Luke's statements that at the time when the Apostles sent St. Peter and St. John to confirm the Samaritan converts the Holy Ghost 'as yet' 'was fallen upon none of them: only they had been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus,' that at the laying on of the Apostles' hands 'they received the Holy Ghost,'¹ and that similarly 'the Holy Ghost came on' the Ephesian disciples of St. John the Baptist when St. Paul 'had laid his hands upon them' subsequently to their reception of Christian Baptism.²

'We have here,' writes Father Puller, 'two great examples of the law of the posteriority of the gift of the Spirit. And accordingly we may deduce the corollary that, if the accounts in Acts viii. and xix. refer to Confirmation, as they certainly do, then all the passages in the Epistles which speak of a gift of the Spirit imparted on a particular occasion, and that occasion subsequent to Baptism, must be referring to Confirmation likewise.'³

And similarly Dr. Mason says,

'It seems, therefore, a plain conclusion that . . . the gift of "Holy Spirit" is no part of Baptism (in the restricted sense of the word), but is the distinctive gift of Confirmation.'⁴

'If the narrative of the conversion of Samaria had left any doubt, the narrative of the disciples at Ephesus makes it clear, that the gift of the Holy Ghost is not attached, even in the most favourable circumstances, to the sacrament of Baptism by itself, but to the laying on of Hands. It is inconceivable that the Baptism which these men underwent by St. Paul's own directions should have been in any way less efficacious than those which are commonly administered in the Church; and yet we do not read "And when they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus, the Holy Ghost came on them," but, "And when Paul laid hands upon them."⁵

On the other hand, we find it stated by Dr. Wirgman, on grounds to which we have already referred,

'The Objective Personal Indwelling of the Holy Ghost cannot be implied or expressed by the phrase "Holy Spirit" as used of the gifts of Confirmation in Acts viii. 17.'⁶

¹ Acts viii. 16-17.

² Acts xix. 5-6.

³ Puller, *What is the distinctive Grace of Confirmation?* p. 22.

⁴ Mason, *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, p. 23.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 26.

⁶ Wirgman, *The Doctrine of Confirmation*, p. 62.

'
Holy
"Rep
Christ
Holy
signifi
Spirit
presse
Confir
Samar

N
Dr. W
fair in
the as
cates
we sa
comp
posse
to the
Dr. W
refers
that h
Fathe
those
in the
to say

'B
ship of
immed
thus p
and to
Peter a
so clos
tinct a
dition
other b
is some
words
to expr
have sa
of Jesu
But, wi
Peter s
diate re

'It is significant that St. Peter on the day of Pentecost connected Holy Baptism with the Personal Indwelling of the Spirit. He said "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (*λήψεσθε τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος*).¹ Here the significant use of the article points to the Personal Indwelling of the Spirit in contradistinction to the subsequent gifts of endowment expressed by the phrase *Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον*, which constitute the grace of Confirmation. These subsequent gifts were conveyed to the baptized Samaritan converts by the laying on of the Apostles' hands.'²

Now, as we have already pointed out, we cannot accept Dr. Wirgman's explanation of Acts viii. 17 and xix. 6. A fair interpretation of those passages requires, in our judgment, the assertion that in Confirmation the Holy Spirit communicates to the soul His Personal Indwelling. But neither are we satisfied with any interpretation of Acts ii. 38 which is compatible with the view that this Personal Indwelling is not possessed before Confirmation. Unable as we are to attach to the use of the article all the significance which it has in Dr. Wirgman's eyes, we yet cannot think that St. Peter here refers to any less gift than that of the Personal Indwelling, or that he dissevers it from Baptism. It is not satisfactory, with Father Puller, to regard St. Peter's words as a promise that those who should be baptized 'might rightly expect to share in the Pentecostal gift'³ by means of a further ceremony, or to say with Dr. Mason,

'Baptism will involve the confession by each person of the Christship of Jesus, and the calling upon His saving Name; and it will immediately admit the baptized into the remission of his sins. Then, thus penitent and cleansed, the believer will be in a position to ask, and to receive, the gift of the Holy Ghost. While, therefore, St. Peter associates the great gift very closely with Christian Baptism—so closely that he does not feel it necessary to particularize any distinct act which will convey it—he yet speaks of Baptism as a condition of obtaining it rather than as the means, and while he ascribes other benefits directly to Baptism, appears to suggest that this benefit is something which comes after. No doubt, if we had only St. Peter's words before us, we might have supposed his "and ye shall receive" to express a grace of Baptism itself—as he might with perfect truth have said, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, and ye shall receive the forgiveness of your sins." But, when we know what was the apostolic practice, and hear St. Peter speak of other blessings in a way which implies a more immediate relation to Baptism, the conclusion appears to be irresistible

¹ Acts ii. 38.

² Wirgman, *The Doctrine of Confirmation*, pp. 64-5.

³ Puller, *What is the distinctive Grace of Confirmation?* p. 24.

that St. Peter looked to impart the gift of the Holy Ghost—in Baptism, indeed, only not in that part of it which would convey the forgiveness of sins, but in that second part of it which we know as Confirmation.¹

Moreover, in the account of the conversion of St. Paul, the possession of the Holy Spirit is connected with the Baptism which he received from the hands of one who was not an Apostle.²

Thus we may say that, looking simply at the four passages, Acts ii. 38, viii. 17, ix. 17-18, and xix. 6, the meaning suggested by a comparison of them is that both in the Sacrament of Baptism and in the Sacrament of Confirmation there is a communication to the soul of the Personal Indwelling of God the Holy Ghost. It must then be asked whether this interpretation is compatible with the words in Acts viii. 16, 'as yet He was fallen upon none of them.' Since Dr. Wirgman's assertion that ἐπιτίπτειν never denotes the Personal Indwelling, but always 'gifts of endowment and ministry,'³ appears to be without support of any kind, we have to seek from other evidence grounds for a decision whether St. Luke's statement means that the Holy Spirit had not yet dwelt within the Samaritan disciples at all, or that He had not yet dwelt within them in His special Confirmation relation.

Postponing for the moment the further consideration of Acts viii. 16, we may say that Acts x. 47 does not tend to make doubtful the view of Acts ii. 38, viii. 17, ix. 17-18, xix. 6 which we have mentioned. Dr. Mason contends that if the Baptismal gift had been bestowed in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon Cornelius and his associates, St. Peter could not have commanded that they should be baptized, and infers that therefore the Baptismal gift cannot be the Personal Indwelling. The latter point does not follow from the former, because the need of the Baptismal union with the Sacred Humanity of Christ would require Baptism; and this passage consequently does not afford anything which bears on our present subject either way.

We have then to consider, in the light of other evidence, whether such an interpretation of Acts viii. 16 is to be adopted as would be incompatible with the belief that the baptized but unconfirmed, as well as the confirmed, possess the Personal Indwelling of the Divine Spirit. Put briefly, the question is, Does 'as yet He was fallen upon none of them' mean that they were not yet temples of the Holy Ghost or that the

¹ Mason, *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, p. 37.

² Acts ix. 17-18.

³ Wirgman, *The Doctrine of Confirmation*, p. 63, note 2.

person
the sp
Does
of Ac
Le
Testa
tation
the sta
'one S
part o
iv. 6 a
His S
'the a
In the
Ghost
be reg
regene
in whi
our he
to dw
as Bap
An
posses
Lord
through
of the
St. Jo
betwe
before
His af
For
were sp
Manho
Ascens
the Bl
person
But we

¹ Dr
takes R
Eph. i. 1
ii. 27, iii
² St.
i. 32-3.
³ Ac
promise
the prom

personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit was not yet theirs in the special way in which they were now to receive Him? Does this passage make it necessary that the obvious meaning of Acts ii. 38 be put aside?

Let us notice that there are other passages in the New Testament bearing on this subject where conflicting interpretations have been suggested. In 1 Corinthians xii. 13 does the statement, We 'were all made to drink into' (or 'of') 'one Spirit' refer to the Baptism mentioned in the former part of the verse, or to some subsequent rite? In Galatians iv. 6 are we to understand that 'God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts' at the same moment that we received 'the adoption of sons,' or as a privilege subsequently given? In the Epistle to St. Titus iii. 5 does the 'renewing of the Holy Ghost' mean His personal indwelling; and, if so, is it to be regarded as communicated by means of the 'washing of regeneration,' or subsequently? And are the many passages in which the Holy Ghost is said to have been 'poured out in our hearts,' or 'given' to us, or 'received' by us, or 'made to dwell in us,' to be regarded as applying to what we know as Baptism, or what we know as Confirmation?¹

And further, if we are to accept the parallel between the possession of the Holy Spirit by the holy Manhood of our Lord and our own case, is He to be regarded as having throughout His human life possessed the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit, or as having previously to His Baptism by St. John the Baptist been without it? And, is our state between Baptism and Confirmation to be compared with His before His Baptism, and our state after Confirmation with His after He was baptized?

For ourselves, we can have little doubt that, while there were special outpourings of the Holy Spirit upon the sacred Manhood of our Lord when He was baptized,² and on His Ascension,³ yet from the first moment of His conception by the Blessed Virgin He was, as Man, in possession of the personal indwelling of the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. But we have a good deal of doubt whether this truth can

¹ Dr. Mason (*The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, pp. 51-2) takes Rom. v. 5, viii. 15; 1 Cor. ii. 12; 2 Cor. i. 22; Gal. iii. 2, 15; Eph. i. 13, 14; iv. 7, 30; St. James iv. 5; 1 St. Peter iv. 10; 1 St. John ii. 27, iii. 24 as all referring to Confirmation.

² St. Matt. iii. 16; St. Mark i. 10; St. Luke iii. 21-22; St. John i. 32-3.

³ Acts ii. 33. A comparison of St. Luke xxiv. 49 shows that 'the promise of the Holy Ghost' (τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος) means the promised gift of the Holy Ghost.

rightly be pressed to support the belief that we receive the personal indwelling at our Baptism. There is a real resemblance between the gift of life to the Manhood of our Lord at His conception and the gift to us of Regeneration at our Baptism, between the gifts for the work of the Ministry at His Baptism and the gifts to us in Confirmation, and between the joy of His Ascension and that which is to be ours in our Resurrection. But we question whether this analogy can be pressed to supply an argument on the point we are considering.

Putting aside, then, any consideration such as we have last mentioned, we are left to inquire which of the interpretations of the various passages in view receives most support from the teaching of Christian Divines, especially the Fathers, and the inferences which appear to be implied in Christian theology generally.

It is an unquestionable fact that great and representative writers both of the East and of the West speak of the Holy Ghost being given in Baptism. Origen, in warning catechumens of the danger of receiving Baptism unworthily, says that 'he who is washed unto salvation receives both the water and the Holy Spirit.'¹ St. Athanasius, referring to the receiving of the Holy Spirit by the Galatians,² asserts that He is 'given to those who believe and are being begotten again by means of the laver of regeneration.'³ St. Cyril of Jerusalem describes Baptism as 'conferring the gift of the Holy Spirit'⁴ and as 'the holy indelible seal,'⁵ and speaks of the Spirit sealing the soul 'as the water cleanses the body' and of 'the seal' being bestowed 'by means of water.'⁶ St. Basil associates 'partaking of the Spirit' with our being 'adopted as sons to God' 'by means of the laver of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost.'⁷ To St.

¹ Origen, *In Ezech. Hom.* vi. 5: 'Qui lavatur in salutem et aquam accipit et Spiritum sanctum.'

² Gal. iii. 2.

³ St. Athan. *Ep. ad Serap.* i. 4: Ποῖον δὲ ἦσαν λαβόντες ἢ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, τὸ διδόμενον τοῖς πιστεύουσιν καὶ ἀναγεννωμένοις διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας;

⁴ St. Cyr. Jer. *Cat. Myst.* ii. 6: πνεύματος ἁγίου δωρεῖς πρόξενον.

⁵ Id. *Procat.* 16: σφραγὶς ἁγία ἀκατάλυτος.

⁶ Id. *Cat.* iii. 3, 4: μέλλει τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σφραγίζειν ὑμῶν τὰς ψυχὰς . . . τὸ μὲν ὕδωρ καθαίρει τὸ σῶμα, τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα σφραγίζει τὴν ψυχὴν . . . τὴν δὲ ὕδατος σφραγίδα.

⁷ St. Basil, *Adv. Eunom.* v. (t. i. p. 303 A, edit. Benedic.): Τοῦτο ἡμᾶς ἀνακαίνω καὶ πάλιν εἰκόνας ἀναδείκνυσιν Θεοῦ διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαίνωστος Πνεύματος ἁγίου νιοθετούμεθα Θεῷ. καὶ πάλιν κτίσις μεταλαμβάνουσα τοῦ Πνεύματος, οὗπερ ἐσπερημένη πεπαλαίωτο.

Grego
St. C
Christ
'wher
Alexa
of the
withi
St. Ep
not re
king i
soul o
Spirit
that '
means
the fir
to us t
guard,
proph
their
'anoin
the Sp
Th
that th

¹ St.

² St.

³ Id.

βαπτίζομαι

⁴ St.

. . . ὁ ἵ

κοινωνός;

Θεοῦ.

⁵ St.

244 F):

καὶ οὐδὲ

⁶ St.

ὁ ἔλαβεν

⁷ Id.

Πνεύματος

σφραγίς

⁸ Th

ἐσφράγισ

γὰρ πᾶς

παλαιὸν

ἐχρίσθη

εἰ δὲ τὸν

χαρίσμα

προφητε

ἐν τῇ δόξ

⁹ Ter

Gregory of Nazianzus Baptism is the 'acquiring of the Spirit.'¹ St. Chrysostom declares that 'the Spirit comes upon' a Christian when he is 'being baptized,'² and that a Christian 'when being baptized' 'partook of the Spirit.'³ St. Cyril of Alexandria regards 'him who has been baptized' as 'partaker of the Divine Nature,' 'having the Holy Ghost dwelling within him,' 'already bearing the title of a temple of God.'⁴ St. Ephraem the Syrian, in declaring that 'the man who has not received Baptism is like unto a house made ready for a king in which the king has never dwelt,'⁵ implies that the soul of a baptized person is a temple which is filled by the Spirit of God. In the later East, St. John of Damascus says that 'the Spirit' is 'the gift which each one received by means of Baptism,'⁶ and that 'we receive by means of Baptism the firstfruits of the Holy Spirit, and our regeneration becomes to us the beginning of a different life, and a seal, and a safeguard, and an illumination,'⁷ while Theophylact connects the prophetic, priestly, and royal character of Christians with their Baptism, which he regards as the means of being 'anointed with the Spirit' and of receiving 'the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.'⁸

There is like teaching in the West. Tertullian asserts that the baptized person 'receives the Spirit of God'⁹ and

¹ St. Greg. Naz. *Orať.* xl. 3: Πνεύματος ἀκολουθήσεις.

² St. Chrys. *In Mat. Hom.* xii. 2: ἐπὶ σὲ βαπτίζομενον τὸ πνεῦμα ἔρχεται.

³ Id. *De Confunc. ad Demet.* i. 8: σὺ θείας ἀπῆλυσας χάριτος βαπτίζομενος καὶ πνεύματος μετέσχες.

⁴ St. Cyril Alex. *In Joan. Ev.* v. 2 (on vii. 39): τὸν ἄρτι βαπτισμένον. . . ὁ δὲ ἐκ Θεοῦ γεγένηται, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, καὶ θέλας φύσεως γέγονε κοινωνός, ἐνοικοῦν ἔχων ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ ναὸς ἤδη χρηματίζων Θεοῦ.

⁵ St. Eph. Syr. *Testamentum (Opera Græca, Romæ, 1743, t. ii. p. 244 F)*: ὁ μὴ εὐλογῶς ἀνὴρ βάπτισμα εὐκλειᾶς οἴκειν τινὶ ἡτοίμασμένῳ βασιλεῖ ὃν καὶ οὐδαμοῦ ᾤκησε βασιλεὺς.

⁶ St. John Dam. *In Ep. ad Thess.* i. (on v. 25): πνεῦμα φησὶ τὸ χάρισμα ὁ ἑλθεὶν ἕκαστος διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος.

⁷ Id. *De Fid. Orth.* iv. 9: διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος λαμβάνομεν, καὶ ἀρχὴ ἑτέρου βίου γίνεται ἡμῖν ἡ παλιγγενεσία καὶ σφραγὶς καὶ φυλακτήριον καὶ φωτισμός.

⁸ Theophylact, *In ii. Ep. ad Cor.* (on i. 21): αὐτὸς ἔχρισεν ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐσφράγισε· τοῦτέστι, προφήτας καὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ ἱερεῖς ἐργάσατο. Τοιοῦτος γὰρ πᾶς βαπτισθεὶς· προφήτης . . . ἱερεὺς . . . βασιλεὺς . . . Ὡς περ οὖν τὸ παλαιὸν οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ βασιλεῖς ἐχρίοντο τῷ ἐλαίῳ, οὕτω καὶ νῦν ἡμεῖς τῷ Πνεύματι ἐχρίσθημεν, δόττος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ Πνεύματος. εἰ δὲ τὸν ἀρραβῶνα ἔδωκε, καὶ τὸ πᾶν δώσει πάντως. Ἀρραβῶνα δὲ λέγει τὰ νῦν χαρίσματα τοῦ Πνεύματος. Ἐκ μέρους γὰρ γινώσκουμεν, καὶ ἐκ μέρους προφητεύομεν· τότε δὲ τὸ τελειὸν ἀποληψόμεθα, ὅτε φανερωθῇται ὁ Χριστὸς ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ.

⁹ Tert. *De Bapt.* 5: 'Recipit enim illum Dei Spiritum.'

that Baptism is the 'acquiring of the Holy Spirit.'¹ St. Cyprian tells Cæcilius that 'the Holy Spirit is received by means of Baptism.'² St. Hilarly of Poitiers describes one of the results of Baptism as 'receiving the Holy Spirit' and 'feeling within us some beginnings of the Holy Spirit.'³ St. Augustine says that even in Baptism conferred by an unworthy minister 'God' 'gives the Holy Spirit,'⁴ and that 'the Holy Spirit dwells in baptized infants though they know it not.'⁵ St. Jerome declares that a baptized person is 'a temple of the Lord,' and connects the forgiveness which Baptism conveys with the possession of the Holy Spirit.⁶ St. Leo regards the privilege of Christians to be temples of the Holy Spirit as the result of Baptism.⁷ In later times, Alcuin speaks of Baptism as the gift of the Holy Spirit,⁸ and St. Thomas Aquinas lays down that 'all who are baptized with the Baptism of Christ receive the Holy Spirit.'⁹

The selections we have thus made from the multitude of quotations which might be given are sufficient to show that, as we said, the representative writers of the East and of the West assert that the Holy Ghost is given in Baptism.

We have next to inquire what the writers to whom we have referred mean by Baptism. If in the passages which we have quoted the word is used in the same sense as that in which we use it, then it is clear the Fathers taught that the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit is given in the Sacrament of Baptism apart from Confirmation. If, on the other hand, in consequence of the ancient practice of administering

¹ Id. *Adv. Marc.* i. 28: 'Si consecutio est Spiritus sancti, quomodo Spiritum attribuet, qui animam non prius contulit?'

² St. Cyp. *Ep.* lxiii. 8: 'Per Baptisma enim Spiritus sanctus accipitur.'

³ St. Hil. *Pict. Tract. in lxiv. Psal.* 15: 'Inebriamur autem ipsi, cum Spiritum sanctum qui fluvius est nuncupatus accipimus. . . . Est autem nobis per Sacramentum Baptismi renatis maximum gaudium, cum quædam in nobis Spiritus sancti initia sentimus.'

⁴ St. Aug. *De Bapt. c. Don.* v. 28: 'Deus ergo dat etiam ipso baptizante Spiritum sanctum.'

⁵ Id. *Ep.* clxxxvii. 26: 'Dicimus ergo in baptizatis parvulis, quamvis id nesciant, habitare Spiritum sanctum.'

⁶ St. Jer. *Adv. Lucif.* 6: 'Quum in Patre et Filio et Spiritu sancto baptizatus homo, templum Domini fiat. . . . Quomodo antiquis sordibus anima purgatur, quæ Sanctum non habet Spiritum?'

⁷ St. Leo, *Serm.* xxi. 3: 'Per Baptismatis sacramentum Spiritus sancti factus es templum.'

⁸ Alcuin, *Expos. in Canticum Graduum* (on cxxxi. 18): 'In ipsius vero Baptismate remissio peccatorum est et sanctificatio et sancti Spiritus donum.'

⁹ St. Thom. Aq. *S. T.* III. xxxix. 6: 'Omnes autem qui Baptismo Christi baptizantur Spiritum Sanctum recipiunt.'

Baptis
used t
only th
taining

It
of the
which
Ghost
of the
tain th
in the
for the
Baptis
and th
tion o
to Fal
having
confir
thians
made t
of the
before
with th
comes
been h
sonal i
Baptis
firmati
tional

¹ Te
quamur,

² St.
sanctific
piendum

³ Ibi
quando
jam nat
qui acci

⁴ Co
νόσφ περ
τῇ κλήνῃ
μὴν οὐδέ
τὸν τῆς
δὲ μὴ τυ

⁵ St.
λέγειν τ
μυστηρί
⁶ Ma

Baptism and Confirmation at the same time, the word is used to denote the whole rite of which our Baptism forms only the first part, then we must seek further means of ascertaining what these writers thought to be the gift of the font.

It has been contended that other places in the writings of the Fathers show that by the word Baptism in all passages which necessarily imply the personal indwelling of the Holy Ghost the whole rite must be meant. Thus, Tertullian, speaking of the reception of the Spirit of God, says 'Not that we obtain the Holy Spirit in the waters, but having been cleansed in the water under the ministry of the angel, we are prepared for the Holy Spirit';¹ St. Cyprian describes the work of Baptism as making a man 'fit to receive the Holy Ghost'² and the regeneration of Baptism as preparing for the reception of the Spirit;³ Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, writing to Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, spoke of Novatian as not having 'obtained the Holy Ghost' since he had not been confirmed;⁴ and St. Chrysostom, commenting on 1 Corinthians xii. 13, interprets St. Paul's words, 'and were all made to drink into one Spirit' as referring to 'that coming of the Spirit, which takes place in us after Baptism and before the Mysteries.'⁵ A comparison of these statements with the clear declarations of the Fathers that the Holy Spirit comes to dwell in the soul in what we call Confirmation has been held to show that all passages which connect the personal indwelling with 'Baptism,' refer to 'that part of the Baptismal Sacrament which we know by the name of Confirmation.'⁶ And this interpretation is said to receive additional support from the consideration of the contention found

¹ Tert. *De Bapt.* 6: 'Non quod in aquis Spiritum sanctum consequamur, sed in aqua emundati sub angelo Spiritui sancto præparamur.'

² St. Cyp. *Ep.* lxxiv. 5, 'Qui enim peccatis in Baptismo expositis sanctificatus est et in novum hominem spiritaliter reformatus ad accipiendum Spiritum sanctum idoneus factus est.'

³ *Ibid.* 7: 'Porro autem non per manus impositionem quis nascitur quando accipit Spiritum sanctum sed in Baptismo ut Spiritum sanctum jam natus accipiat. . . . Nec enim potest accipi Spiritus nisi prius fuerit qui accipiat.'

⁴ Cornelius, cit. Eus. *H. E.* vi. 43: 'Ὁς βοηθούμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπορκιστῶν νόσῳ περιπεσὼν χελεπῇ καὶ ἀποθανεῖσθαι ὅσον οὐδέπω νομιζόμενος ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ κλίνῃ ἣ ἔκειτο περιχυθεὶς ἔλαβεν· εἴ γε χρὴ λέγειν τὸν τοιοῦτον εἰληφέναι. Οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ τῶν λοιπῶν ἔτυχε, διαφυγὼν τὴν νόσον, ὧν χρὴ μεταλαμβάνειν κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας κανόνα, τοῦ τε σφραγισθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου. Τούτου δὲ μὴ τυχὼν, πῶς ἂν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἔτυχε;

⁵ St. Chrys. *In Ep.* i. ad Cor. Hom. xxx. 2: 'ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκεῖ νῦν ἐκείνην λέγειν τοῦ πνεύματος τὴν ἐπιφοίτησιν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος καὶ πρὸ τῶν μυστηρίων ἐγγινώσκουσαν.'

⁶ Mason, *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, Preface, p. xv.

in the teaching of St. Leo¹ as well as of St. Cyprian,² that the Holy Spirit cannot be given outside the Church.

It is further urged that, while the Service Books of the Church speak emphatically of the operation of the Holy Spirit in Baptism upon the waters of the font and the soul of the baptized person, when they refer to the gift of the personal indwelling, they always do so in connexion with Confirmation. And a claim is made that the teaching of the modern East distinguishing an operation of the Holy Ghost outside us in Baptism from a presence of the Holy Ghost within us in Confirmation supports the opinion that the Fathers did not mean to ascribe the gift of the personal indwelling to Baptism in the modern sense.³

On the other hand, this contention has been subjected to severe criticism. Whatever ambiguity there may sometimes be in the Patristic use of the word Baptism, the connexion between the reception of the Holy Spirit and the 'washing' or the 'water' or the 'laver of regeneration' in some of the passages we have quoted has been thought to indicate that the writers understood the personal indwelling of the Holy Ghost to be bestowed in the rite to which the word is now restricted. The words of Cornelius have been taken to mean that Novatian had not 'obtained the Holy Ghost' in the

¹ St. Leo, *Ep.* clix. 7: 'Hi qui Baptismum ab hæreticis acceperunt, cum antea baptizati non fuissent, sola invocatione Spiritus sancti per impositionem manuum confirmandi sunt, quia formam tantum Baptismi sine sanctificationis virtute sumpserunt. . . . Sola sanctificatio Spiritus sancti invocanda est, ut quod ab hæreticis nemo accipit a Catholicis sacerdotibus consequatur'; clxvii. 18: 'Per manus impositionem, invocata virtute Spiritus sancti, quam hæreticis accipere non potuerunt, Catholicis copulandi sunt.'

² St. Cyprian, *e.g.*, *Ep.* lxxvi. 11: 'Qui hæreticis sive schismaticis patrocinantur, respondeant nobis an habeant Spiritum sanctum an non habeant. Si habent, cur illic baptizatis, quando ad nos veniunt, manus imponitur ad accipiendum Spiritum sanctum, cum jam utique illic acceptus sit ubi si fuit dari potuit? Si autem foris tincti hæretici et schismatici non habent Spiritum sanctum et ideo apud nos manus imponitur ut hic accipiatur quod illic nec est nec dari potest, manifestum est nec remissionem peccatorum dari per eos posse quos constat Spiritum sanctum non habere.'

³ This claim appears to be chiefly based upon the teaching of Macarius, Bishop of Vinnitza, and Rector of the Ecclesiastical Academy of St. Petersburg. In the French translation of his work entitled *Théologie Dogmatique Orthodoxe*, § 210 (t. ii. p. 425), he says: 'Le principal effet invisible du sacrement de l'Onction, c'est de communiquer aux fidèles le Saint-Esprit. Dans le Baptême nous ne sommes que purifiés de tout péché et régénérés par la vertu du Saint-Esprit, mais nous ne sommes pas dignes encore de recevoir cet Esprit en nous et de devenir ses temples; par l'Onction il nous est communiqué avec tous les dons de sa grâce, qui sont indispensables pour la vie spirituelle.'

special
stomach
to our
gift of
Though
recept
Mason
is pers
His Pr
renewe
St. Cy
ness, v
Spirit
out up
context
the gif
person
dwell.'
receive
certain
Ghost
some h
refer to

¹ St.
salutari
sed clinic
qui plur
istos dep
nobis da
quisquis
Aut si a
tantum p
commode
secuti su
muneris
sint tamen
suram da
gratia spi
versation
Quodsi a
spiritibus
usque ad
virus ami
sanctifica
opprimitu
sicut scor
prævalere
qui scorp
potestate
quo bapti

special Confirmation way. The interpretation by St. Chrysostom of 'were all made to drink into one Spirit' as referring to our Confirmation has been held to be consistent with a real gift of the personal indwelling of the Spirit in Baptism. Though St. Cyprian's teaching that Baptism prepares for the reception of the Spirit at first sight appears to favour Dr. Mason's view, it has been pointed out that if the Holy Ghost is personally given in Baptism, it is none the less true that by His Presence within the soul He makes it ready to receive His renewed Presence with the special Confirmation gifts, and that St. Cyprian also expressly says of those who, owing to sickness, were baptized without being confirmed that the Holy Spirit 'is not given' to them 'by measure' but is 'poured out upon' them 'in His fulness,' a phrase which, taken in its context, could with difficulty be interpreted to mean less than the gift of the personal indwelling, and further speaks of such persons as being those in whom 'the Holy Spirit begins to dwell.'¹ While the statement of Tertullian, 'Not that we receive the Holy Spirit in the waters,' taken by itself, is certainly most easily interpreted as meaning that the Holy Ghost is not received in Baptism apart from Confirmation, some have thought it easier to understand that passage to refer to the reception of the Spirit with the specific Confir-

¹ St. Cyprian, *Ep.* lxxvi. 13-15: 'Porro autem quod quidam eos salutari aqua et fide legitima Christi gratiam consecutos non Christianos, sed clinicos vocant, non invenio, unde hoc nomen assumant, nisi forte qui plura et secretiora legerunt, apud Hippocratem vel Soranum clinicos istos deprehenderunt. . . . Et idcirco, quantum fide concipere et sentire nobis datur, mea sententia hæc est, ut Christianus judicetur legitimus, quisquis fuerit in ecclesia lege et jure fidei divinam gratiam consecutus. Aut si aliquis existimat eos nihil consecutos eo, quod aqua salutari tantum perfusi sint, sed inanes et vacui sunt, non decipiantur, ut si incommodum languoris evaserint et convalescerint, baptizentur. . . . An consecuti sunt quidem gratiam dominicam, sed brevior et minor mensura muneris divini ac Spiritus sancti, ut habeantur quidem Christiani, non sint tamen ceteris adæquandi? Quinimo Spiritus sanctus non ad mensuram datur, sed super credentem totus infunditur. . . . Plane eadem gratia spiritalis, quæ aequaliter in Baptismo a credentibus sumitur, in conversatione atque actu nostro postmodum vel minuitur vel augetur. . . . Quodsi aliquis in illo movetur, quod quidam de iis, qui ægri baptizantur, spiritibus adhuc immundis tentantur, sciat diaboli nequitiam pertinacem usque ad aquam salutarem valere, in Baptismo vero omne nequitiae suae virus amittere. . . . Cum tamen ad aquam salutarem atque ad Baptismi sanctificationem venit, scire debemus et fidere, quia illic diabolus opprimitur et homo Deo dicatus divina indulgentia liberatur. Nam sicut scorpii et serpentes, qui in sicco prævalent, in aquam præcipitati prævalere non possunt aut sua venena retinere, sic et spiritus nequam, qui scorpii et serpentes appellantur et tamen per nos data a Domino potestate calcantur, permanere ultra non possunt in hominis corpore in quo baptizato et sanctificato incipit Spiritus sanctus habitare.'

mation gifts than to interpret it so as to be opposed to what they think to be the general tone of Christian teaching. It has been found possible to maintain that, if one or two passages in North African writers should restrict the personal indwelling to the latter portion of the whole rite, that fact, even apart from the consideration of passages of a different tendency in the same writers, could not rightly be given great weight against very much teaching all over the Church, when it is remembered that the North African doctrine on the subject of Baptism was not altogether untouched by error. And it has been doubted whether the passages in St. Leo to which we have referred have any bearing at all on this question, since they were written in view of an abnormal state of things and do not necessarily mean more than that there was no valid Confirmation outside the Church.

Following up this line of thought, it has been argued that as the general tendency of the New Testament is in favour of the belief that the personal indwelling is bestowed in Baptism, while there is one passage—Acts viii. 16—which at first sight might easily seem to deny this, so the general teaching of the Fathers similarly affirms this gift, while there are a few passages which at first sight appear to contradict it. A further inference has been that it is reasonable to regard the true teaching to be the assertion of the personal indwelling, and to suppose that the exceptional passage in Holy Scripture refers to the special method and purposes of the descent of the Holy Spirit in Confirmation, and that the exceptional passages in early Christian writers are either to be similarly interpreted or are instances of individual expressions of opinion which did not represent the general mind of the Church.

This view derives some support from the fact that great Fathers speak as if there were a close connexion between the regeneration which Baptism undoubtedly conveys and the possession of the Holy Spirit. Thus St. Basil writes that 'those who partake' of the Spirit are 'conformed to be sons' of God,¹ and St. Cyril of Alexandria joins together the 'gift of the Spirit' and 'regeneration into God by means of Holy Baptism.'²

Nor is it the case that the Service Books of the Church

¹ St. Basil, *Adv. Eunom.* v (t. i. p. 302 A, edit. Benedic.) Εἰκὼν μὲν Θεοῦ Χριστός, ὅς ἐστι, φησὶν, εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου· εἰκὼν δὲ Υἱοῦ, τὸ Πνεῦμα, καὶ οἱ τοῦτον μεταλαμβάνοντες υἱοὶ σύμμορφοι.

² St. Cyril Alex. *Theaurus*, xi. *ad fin.*: Κατὰ δὲ τὸν Ἰωάννην καιρὸν καὶ λοιπὸν ἐφέξης ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος δόσις καὶ ἡ διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος εἰς Θεὸν ἀναγέννησις διὰ πίστεως ἀρπάζεται.

never
the ear
Service
Spirit
for the
the wat
ing of t
the effe

'Mar
who is b
man, whi
putting o
Him tha
likeness
also of E
Spirit an
receive th
first-born

It is
in this p
to disso
doubtful
an instan
is someti

We h
modern
rius, that

¹ See
μεταποιηθῆναι
ἄνθρωπον τ
νέον τὸν ἀνά
τῷ ὁμοιώματι
ἀναστάσεως
αἰῶνος τῆς
καὶ συγκρατῶ

² The C
the Holy Sp
describes t
(Hard. Co
Church' d
baptized be
body, in the
for growth
the Russian
'as in Bapt
takers o
τερτοιας λογι
part i. quest
they appear
in Confirma

VOL. XI

never speak of the personal indwelling in connexion with the earlier part of the whole rite. The Greek Baptismal Service distinctly contemplates the reception of the Holy Spirit by means of the touch of the water. In the prayer for the blessing of the water the priest not only prays that the water may be the 'laver of regeneration' and the 'renewing of the Spirit,' but also goes on, with evident reference to the effects of the administration of the water,

'Manifest Thyself, O Lord, upon this water, and grant that he who is being baptized in it may be re-made unto putting off the old man, which waxeth corrupt according to the lusts of deceit, and unto putting on the new man, which is renewed according to the image of Him that created him; in order that, being planted together in the likeness of His death through Baptism, he may be made partaker also of His Resurrection, and, having guarded the gift of Thy Holy Spirit and having increased the grace committed to him, may receive the prize of the high calling and be numbered among the first-born which are enrolled in Heaven.'¹

It is difficult either to explain the 'gift of the Holy Spirit' in this place as meaning less than the personal indwelling or to dissociate it from the operation of the water; and it is doubtful whether this phraseology can rightly be regarded as an instance of the way in which in the Eastern services time is sometimes regarded as of no import.

We have been unable to find adequate support in other modern Eastern teaching for the position adopted by Macarius, that the personal indwelling is not conferred in Baptism.²

¹ See Goar, *Euchologion*, p. 353: 'Επιφάνηθι, κύριε, τούτῳ καὶ δὸς μεταποιηθῆναι τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ βαπτιζόμενον εἰς τὸ ἀποθέσθαι μὲν τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν φθειρόμενον μετὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπίτης· ἐνδύσασθαι δὲ τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτὸν, ἵνα γενόμενος σύμφυτος τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος κοινωνῶς καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως γένηται, καὶ φύλαξας τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ ἁγίου σου πνεύματος καὶ αὔξησας τὴν παρακαταθήκην τῆς χάριτος δέξῃται τὸ βραβεῖον τῆς ἁγίας κλήσεως καὶ συγκαταριθμηθῇ τοῖς πρωτοτόκοις τοῖς ἀπογεγραμμένοις ἐν οὐρανῷ.

² The Greek Baptismal Service already quoted speaks of 'the gift of the Holy Spirit' as being conferred in Baptism. The Synod of Bethlehem describes the baptized as 'temples of God' (ναοὶ Θεοῦ): see cap. 16 (Hard. *Concilia*, xi. 252 A). The 'Longer Catechism of the Russian Church' defines 'Unction with Chrism' as 'a Sacrament in which the baptized believer, being anointed with holy chrism on certain parts of the body, in the name of the Holy Ghost, receives the gifts of the Holy Ghost for growth and strength in spiritual life': see Blackmore, *Doctrine of the Russian Church*, pp. 87-8. The 'Orthodox Confession' says that 'as in Baptism we are regenerated, so in the holy Unction we become partakers of the Holy Ghost' (διὰ καθὼς με τὸ βάπτισμα ἀναγεννώμεθα, τέτοιας λογῆς, με τὸ ἅγιον μύρον γενόμεθα μέτοχοι τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος): see part i. question 105. If these statements are consistent with one another, they appear to mean that the Holy Spirit is received both in Baptism and in Confirmation.

On the ground, then, of actual teaching in Holy Scripture and the Church weighty reasons have been adduced in support of the belief that those who are baptized and not yet confirmed are the temples of the Holy Ghost filled by His Presence. It has also been pointed out that there is very much in the natural inferences of theology which tends in the same direction.

Holy Baptism makes the soul of the baptized person regenerate. This regeneration carries with it the gift of being a Christian. It is difficult to suppose, in the light of Scriptural and Patristic teaching about the operations of God the Holy Ghost, that one who is a Christian is without His personal indwelling. The difference between the action of the Holy Spirit on a human spirit from without and His action upon it from within is involved in much obscurity. Whatever it may mean, the difficulty of a person being a Christian and not being a temple filled with the Holy Ghost, acted upon by Him from within, remains.

Holy Baptism, again, makes the baptized person a member of Christ. He is therefore by virtue of His Baptism linked into the sacred and glorified Humanity of our Lord. In that Humanity the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit permanently and continuously abides. There are grave objections to supposing that those who have been made members of the Body of Christ in Baptism remain until Confirmation without the inner presence of the Holy Spirit which is in Christ's Body.

As we have already said, we doubt whether the analogy between our Lord's conception as Man and our Baptism can be pressed so far as to build an argument upon it that the relation of the Holy Spirit to His Humanity in the early days of His life on earth is the same as the relation of the Holy Spirit to the baptized. So far as it has any bearing at all on the subject under consideration, it lends support to the belief that the baptized possess the personal indwelling before their Confirmation, since, as we have pointed out, it is not to be supposed that our Lord before His Baptism was without it.

It is not out of place to refer to the teaching of the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England. It is there very distinctly implied that the baptized receive the Holy Spirit Himself. In the Baptismal Services we find not only the phrases 'regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost,' 'baptized with water and the Holy Ghost,' 'sanctify him with the Holy Ghost,' 'that all things belonging

to the
infant
Thy H
he' (or
'heirs'

'Doubt
ably rec
Him by
bestow
blessing
kingdom

And th
at first
these p
everlas
attain
vious p
the Ho
is aske
which

Dr.
follow
is 'defi
regener
genera
whatev
minds
the wor
as a na

Fur
divines
of the
widely

¹ Ma
² Cra
'In Bap
³ Ric
water in
is given.

⁴ Ho
Sacrame
which re
so throu
imputati
divine v
their fir
the Holy

to the Spirit may live and grow in him,' 'regenerate this infant with Thy Holy Spirit;' but also the prayer 'Give Thy Holy Spirit to this infant' (or 'these persons') 'that he' (or 'they') 'may be born again and be made an heir' (or 'heirs') 'of everlasting salvation;' and the clear words,

'Doubt ye not therefore, but earnestly believe, that He will favourably receive these present persons, truly repenting, and coming unto Him by faith; that He will grant them remission of their sins, and bestow upon them the Holy Ghost; that He will give them the blessing of eternal life, and make them partakers of His everlasting kingdom.'

And the language of the prayer after the Baptism of adults, at first sight of a strange character, 'Give Thy Holy Spirit to these persons that, being now born again, and made heirs of everlasting salvation,' 'they may continue Thy servants and attain Thy promises,' when taken in connexion with the previous prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit, really implies that the Holy Spirit has been bestowed upon them, and that God is asked to be continuously calling out the power of the gift which He has granted.

Dr. Mason is, indeed, of opinion that the words which follow the prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit show that it is 'defined and restricted' to be 'such a gift or impartition as regenerates, not that which takes up its abode in the regenerate.'¹ We have been unable to find any evidence whatever to support a view that such a restriction was in the minds of the compilers of the Prayer Book; and, so far as the words themselves are concerned, it can hardly be regarded as a natural interpretation.

Further, without attempting to form a catena of English divines, we may point out, as helping to elucidate the meaning of the Book of Common Prayer, that theologians differing as widely from each other as Cranmer² and Ridley,³ Hooker⁴ and

¹ Mason, *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, p. 427.

² Cranmer, *Answer to Gardiner*, book iii. p. 64, Parker Society edition: 'In Baptism we receive the Holy Ghost.'

³ Ridley, *Disputation at Oxford*, p. 240, Parker Society edition: 'The water in Baptism hath grace promised, and by that grace the Holy Spirit is given.'

⁴ Hooker, *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, v. lx. 2: 'Baptism is a Sacrament which God hath instituted in His Church, to the end that they which receive the same might thereby be incorporated into Christ, and so through His most precious merit obtain as well that saving grace of imputation which taketh away all former guiltiness, as also that infused divine virtue of the Holy Ghost which giveth to the powers of the soul their first disposition towards future newness of life.' That the 'virtue of the Holy Ghost' in this passage means the Holy Ghost Himself is shown

Jewel,¹ Barrow² and Beveridge³ affirm the gift of the Holy Spirit in Baptism, while, in addition to much in the writings of Bishop Jeremy Taylor which appears to imply that the personal indwelling is not received until Confirmation, there are also passages which are inconsistent with that view.⁴

There are, then, reasons for doubting whether any doctrine will do justice to the teaching of Holy Scripture and of the Fathers, or, indeed, of the Church of England, which does not, besides asserting a gift of the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit at Confirmation, affirm that at Baptism He takes up His abode within the soul. Yet there is certainly to be found a degree of emphasis on the personal coming of the Holy Spirit in Confirmation, surpassing that with reference to Baptism, which may make it doubtful whether the difference between the action of the Holy Spirit in the two Sacraments is fully met simply by saying that in Baptism He is present chiefly to cleanse, and in Confirmation He is present chiefly to strengthen. Can any further distinction be made, consistently with an assertion of His presence within the soul by virtue of each Sacrament? With great diffidence we would suggest that such a distinction may perhaps be rightly found in regard to the method of His working. It may be true that He is present within the soul of the baptized but unconfirmed rather indirectly than directly, rather because He dwells in the Sacred Humanity of Christ to which the baptized are joined than because of a special

by lxiv. 4, where Hooker says that in Baptism 'God doth bestow presently remission of sins and the Holy Ghost.'

¹ Jewel, *Treatise on the Sacraments*, p. 1128, Parker Society edition: 'Baptized infants are the temples and tabernacles of the Holy Ghost.'

² Barrow, *The Doctrine of the Sacraments: Of Baptism*, § 2: 'In Baptism the gift of God's Holy Spirit is conferred.'

³ Beveridge, *Sermon xxxv.* vol. ii. 176-90, in *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, especially pp. 183-4: 'As baptizing necessarily implies the use of water, so our being made thereby disciples of Christ as necessarily implies our partaking of His Spirit; for all that are baptized, and so made the disciples of Christ, are thereby made the members of His Body; and are therefore said to be "baptized into Christ." But they who are in Christ, members of His Body, must needs partake of the Spirit that is in Him their Head. . . . He' (*i.e.* St. Peter) 'doth not only assure them in the name of God that upon their being baptized they should infallibly receive the Holy Ghost to sanctify and regenerate them.'

⁴ To understand Bishop Jeremy Taylor's position it is necessary to refer, not only to his *Xpious τελεωτην, a Discourse of Confirmation, passim*, but also to his *Life of our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, Part i. Discourse 6: see especially §§ 20-23: to be 'made partakers of the Holy Ghost' is there explained of Baptism, and 'the Spirit of Sanctification' is said to be in the baptized.

desce
presen
specia
Script
may,
of the
of Bap
truth
as late
W
Sacram
are as
Bread
other
Sacram
than o
Sacram
on the
essent
Confir
as the
selves
seven
Sacram
More

In
from I
of Co
silence
of so t
a grea
letter
careful
book.
We ha
agree.
are sta
is said
human
the Co
(pp. 48
'Synod
binding

¹ W

descent upon them, while in the confirmed He comes to be present rather directly than indirectly, rather because of His special descent, falling upon them, to use the words of Holy Scripture, than for any other reason. Such a distinction may, we are disposed to think, account for the different sides of the Scriptural and Patristic language about the Sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation, while it is in harmony with the truth which underlies the teaching to which we have referred as lately given by Canon Gore.

We have spoken of Baptism and Confirmation as two Sacraments. Dr. Mason, as we have seen, asserted that they are as much parts of one Sacrament as are the Eucharistic Bread and the Eucharistic Chalice. Dr. Wirgman, on the other hand, is at great pains to assert that they are separate Sacraments. Is not this difference one rather of terminology than of anything more important? As the number of the Sacraments is not really a theological question, but depends on the definition given to the word Sacrament, so there is no essential difference between a statement that Baptism and Confirmation are two Sacraments and a description of them as the first and the second parts of one Sacrament. To ourselves the terminology which speaks of the Sacraments as seven in number, and of Baptism and Confirmation as two Sacraments, appears to have great practical convenience. More than that we should hesitate to say.

In the *Church Times* for November 19 a letter appeared from Dr. Wirgman, in which he complained that his *Doctrine of Confirmation* had been received with a 'conspiracy of silence.' That the *Church Quarterly Review* had no intention of so treating it may be shown by mentioning the fact that a great part of this article had been written before the letter was published. There is certainly good reason for careful attention to much which Dr. Wirgman says in his book. We are unable, indeed, unreservedly to commend it. We have already mentioned some points in which we disagree. In many respects it is the reverse of strong. There are statements which are greatly to be regretted: as when it is said that there is no 'irreparable division in the fallen human race until the Final Judgment' (p. 5); or implied that the Confirmation of the Churches of the East is invalid (pp. 488-94); or when the Lambeth Conference is called a 'Synod' and the possibility of its giving a 'distinct ruling' binding the Anglican Church is contemplated (p. 494).¹ And

¹ We wrote at some length on the character and powers of the Lam-

the reference of Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Hutchings to 'a Creed professed by Persian Bishops at Seleucia in A.D. 410, which' 'acknowledges the "Living Paraclete" as "ex Patre et Filio"' (p. 31), should not have been mentioned without pointing out that there are grave reasons for doubting the genuineness of the canons in question.¹ Nor are we in all respects satisfied with the detailed treatment of the Patristic passages referred to. Still, in spite of some faults, Dr. Wirgman is entitled to our gratitude for having challenged, and shown reasons for challenging, the idea that the theory advocated by Dr. Mason has made good its claim to be considered the teaching of Holy Scripture and the Fathers.

The divergence of opinion among English Catholics on the subject of the relation of Confirmation to Baptism is much to be regretted. Yet there is a side to it which is a matter for great thankfulness. It is not so very long since a small number of Churchmen were struggling to obtain adequate recognition for the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, and since there were few who taught clearly the Sacramental character of Confirmation, or laid any stress on the gift of the Holy Spirit in it. Now there are very many to whom all these are fixed points to be taken as unquestionably true, whatever may be the exact truth on other matters connected with either Sacrament. As this is a matter for thankfulness, so also is it for hope. It is one of the many signs of God's blessing upon the Church of England which He grants to encourage those whom He calls to work for Him within her fold.

ART. VII.—BENJAMIN JOWETT.

The Life and Letters of Benjamin Jowett, M.A., Master of Balliol College, Oxford. By EVELYN ABBOTT, M.A., LL.D., and LEWIS CAMPBELL, M.A., LL.D. (London: 1897.)

IN addition to the interest of this book as a portrait of a remarkable individual, it commands attention as a description of one of the most influential and characteristic figures of the last two generations. Professor Jowett's life, from the

beth Conference in our last number; see *Church Quarterly Review*, October 1897, pp. 190-4.

¹ See Hefele, *History of the Councils of the Church*, ii. 445 (English translation).

time
Maste
presen
amids
especi
of this
increa
mover
better
and te
probab
repres
learnin
close o
to gui
hymn
literat
eviden
much
meant
engag
especi
detach
Consi
of the
real a
repres
the re
condu
their r

W
which
the bo
they h
add in
which
some
use of
entirel
usually
went
recogn
good
'Have
two d

time he became Scholar of Balliol to the date of his death as Master extends from 1836 to 1897—over the whole of the present reign; and his career at Oxford was thus passed amidst all the successive movements of thought which, especially at that university, have been so striking a feature of this memorable period. He gradually became, in an ever-increasing degree, the chief figure in the so-called Liberal movement of the last forty or fifty years, and he illustrates better, perhaps, than anyone else what the real significance and tendency of that movement has been and is. He was probably its acutest and, on the whole, most learned representative. There were, indeed, curious gaps in his learning, as exemplified in the singular fact that, towards the close of his life, he has to apply to the late Mr. J. A. Symonds to guide him to the text of some of the most familiar Latin hymns. But he was familiar, at all events, with the whole literature of liberal thought, from Hegel, by whom he was evidently much influenced, to recent years; and he knew much better, for instance, than Dean Stanley what it all meant. Although, moreover, he was at one time actively engaged in the conflict, his position throughout life, and especially at its close, enabled him to look at it from a detached point of view, and to judge of it independently. Considered in this aspect, the book is a revelation not merely of the character and principles of Professor Jowett, but of the real and inner nature of the school of thought which he represented, and which he did much to foster; and we think the result must be a decisive condemnation both of his own conduct and of that school of thought, in respect at least to their relation to the Church of England.

We cannot congratulate the editors on the manner in which they have executed their task. They have encumbered the book, especially at the outset, and in many of the letters they have quoted, with a number of trivialities, which do not add in the slightest degree to our knowledge of Jowett, and which make the memoir a great deal more bulky and wearisome than it might have been. What can be the possible use of informing us that the 'face of Mr. Jowett's father was entirely shaven,' that 'he invariably dressed in black, and usually wore a dress coat' (i. 27), or that when Jowett first went to Oxford, it was arranged that a friend should recognize him by the colour of his tie (p. 39); or what is the good of taking up space with such passages in letters as 'Have you gone to Robin Hood's Bay, or whither? The two days which I spent at Cambridge leave a charming

recollection on my mind' (ii. 379); or 'I have thought of you and Alfred many times during the last month, but being lazy and rather tired, I had not the energy to write?' (ii. 341). Nearly all modern biographers sin against their readers in this manner. If one desires to do justice to a man like Jowett, one is bound to run the eye, at least, through the whole of the memoir, and these trivialities are pure waste of time. It is not only for the convenience of readers that it is the business of an editor to save them this useless labour, but he greatly damages the effect of his own work by such neglect, the great features become obscured in mere details, and the impression produced is proportionately dulled. Whoever desires to do the utmost justice to a friend's or hero's memory will take care to bring his memoir within one volume. Such an achievement requires artistic power and great pains, but these ought to be at the service of anyone who wishes to exhibit to his contemporaries and to posterity a great character or a great career. However, the book contains the materials which might have been made into a good biography, and will enable a careful reader to form a sufficient conception of Jowett's character and work.

Some aspects of that character and work are admirable, and well deserve the honour and gratitude which Jowett commanded. The integrity in the ordinary affairs of life, the industry, high spirit and self-command, which he exhibited from his earliest days, are very remarkable. His father, of whom he has none but kind words to say, must have been an impracticable person, and for a large part of his hardest and most struggling years, as a tutor at Oxford, Jowett seems to have contributed no less than 400*l.* a year to the support of his mother. He discharged this filial duty in the most simple and natural spirit, and it becomes known quite incidentally. His domestic affections were strong and tender, and he says in after life, when his mother, brothers and sisters were all gone, that they were seldom absent from his thoughts. There are touching references 'to the great want in life, which can never be supplied,' 'and which I must do without,' 'one happiness which I have never had.' It may be that he was one of those instances, not very rare at the universities, in which the son of poor parents, after obtaining a fellowship by his abilities, sacrifices the domestic happiness of his own life to support and comfort them. The strain thus placed on his means during the best years of his manhood renders the more admirable the patience with which he submitted to the long-continued denial of an adequate stipend for the Greek

Profess
spirit
for thi
bers o
ment.
manne
'It is

'from
show r
energy
'Bu
see an
money
'Co
allowe
'W
that th
far gre
(i. 306

In
teristic

'It
to be t
accept
of a h
meet a
have s

H
stanc
exem
and h
was a
mean
maste
circu

B
tratin
disting
this r
later,
exam
part o
was t
chara
under

Professorship which he held in the university, and his high spirit in declining the gift of 2,000*l.*, which, in compensation for this injustice, had been generously collected among members of the university who resented the unfairness of his treatment. Nothing could be more graceful and dignified than the manner in which he acknowledged and declined this offer: 'It is the greatest pleasure,' he says, to obtain

'from my friends such a testimony of their regard. I will try to show my gratitude in the only way that I am able, by increasing energy in the work of the Professorship.

'But I cannot accept their munificent present. Though I wish to see an endowment provided for the Chair, I ought not to receive money from those on whom I have no claim.

'Could I have anticipated such generosity, I would never have allowed you and others to take so much trouble on my behalf.

'Will you give my best thanks to the subscribers, and assure them that the preservation of the list of their names gives me a satisfaction far greater than the pecuniary advantage which they designed for me?' (i. 306).

In a private letter of the same date, he says, with a characteristic and humorous touch, speaking of himself:

'It is a great pity, that though he loves money, which he believes to be the source of every good, he could not make up his mind to accept it. . . . It does not do, and is not consistent with the dignity of a human being, to have received about 20*l.* from everybody you meet at dinner, yet he is very sensible that it is a great thing to have such friends' (i. 307).

His generous use of money in after life, when his circumstances were easy, was in harmony with the spirit thus exemplified. His liberality to the college was unbounded, and he was always glad to help a younger man in need. He was a thorough man of business, and knew well what money meant, and he had in a high degree the great gift of being its master and not its servant, alike in narrow and in affluent circumstances.

But these matters, though of much significance in illustrating character, do not touch his great distinction. That distinction consisted in his work as Tutor of a College. In this respect, subject to one grave qualification, to be mentioned later, which affects his whole position, he has left a memorable example. The best energies of his mind, and the greater part of his time, were lavishly bestowed on his pupils, and it was the pride and delight of his life to mould their minds and characters. The present Warden of Merton, who was an undergraduate in the fifties, says:

'In my opinion Jowett's heroic industry, during his tutorial career, has never been fully appreciated. At almost all hours of the day, and up to a very late hour at night, his door was always open to every man in the college seeking help, and though I was never among his chosen disciples, I continued after taking my degree to bring him answers to questions at my own request, which he looked over and criticized as carefully as ever. No other tutor within my experience has ever approached him in the depth and extent of his pastoral supervision, if I may so call it, of young thinkers; and it may truly be said that in his pupil room, thirty, forty, or fifty years ago, were disciplined many of the minds which are now exercising a wide influence over the nation' (i. 202).

His devotion was not even limited to his own pupils. The special care of undergraduates was, of course, distributed among the various tutors; but, say the editors,

'those whose promise and aspiration were above the average, if they had not the good fortune to be Jowett's pupils, were only too glad to avail themselves of the permission which he readily gave them, to bring essays or pieces of composition to his room, in addition to the regular work with their tutor. He treated them, in such cases, as if they were really his pupils, and the work done for him was entered into with greater eagerness and delight than the ordinary college exercises' (i. 199).

He made it his pleasure, as much as his duty, to enter into their individual characters and wants, and to guide them at each step of their career. The phrase 'a paternal from Jowett,' to describe a letter of advice from him, illustrates the nature of his influence. It was not confined to the ordinary opportunities of College influence, but was maintained in the vacations, and in a young man's subsequent career. One of the chief methods, in fact, in which Jowett exerted his influence over his best pupils was by companionship in reading parties. The late Mr. F. T. Palgrave, for instance, says:

'During my Oxford time, and for years after, despite his heavy work during Term time, and the friends ready to welcome him during vacation, he would constantly devote some weeks of the Long to study in some pleasant place, with any undergraduate he had noticed as of promise, though disposed not to make the most of himself. These efforts, of course, were not always enduringly successful. Yet there must be, or have been, not a few, perhaps, who could look back to these vacations as forming, more or less, a critical moment in their lives, a "choice of Hercules." This, indeed, throughout his own life was (it has always seemed to me) one of the most admirable points in his character. The kind counsel—wise, if not always applicable—to work while yet it was day, to do all that a man could—a doctrine wherein he may have been encouraged by

Dr. J.
receiv
have b
one's
inter
son, b
rever
plete
appea

It
deavo
that,
to D
fore t
been
a 'wo
thoug
'of p
with
patho
this v
timat
effort
strug
his li
rema
exec
he g
of th
and
shou
perpe
youn
pani
tutor
which
dista
stron
the f
noti
the y
serio
sure
mind
been

Dr. Johnson's example—friends old and young never failed to receive from him at all times and seasons. One might sometimes have been tempted to pray that his precious balms might not break one's head, if the clear candour, good sense, and deep affectionate interest of the adviser had not been always obvious. Even Tennyson, between whom and the Master there was equal love and reverence for some forty years, although he had surely done a complete man's work, Jowett would still urge, after the *Idylls* had appeared, to attempt some new and greater song' (i. 137).

It is a striking illustration of this habit of strenuous endeavour to stimulate the energies of his friends, young and old, that, in a letter to which we shall again refer (ii. 177), written to Dean Stanley in 1880, and therefore less than a year before the Dean's death, he tells him that his work has hitherto been of a transient nature, and calls upon him to undertake a 'work of a deeper kind, the last result of many theological thoughts and experiences'—nothing less, in fact, than that 'of placing religion on a rational basis.' He ends this letter with words to which Stanley's death soon gave a singular pathos—'Farewell. I shall not intrude upon you again in this way.' His influence in this respect was the more legitimate and effectual, because it was but the reflex of his efforts after his own improvement, and his own constant struggle to do as much as he possibly could. To the end of his life he is continually laying out plans for occupying the remainder of his years in old and new reading, and in executing some great literary task, or preparing for one. As he grew older, his anxiety increases to make the utmost use of the time left him, and he is perpetually reminding himself and his friends that the last years of his life may be, and should be, the best of all. This wonderful self-discipline and perpetual energy was fitted to make a deep impression on young men, and to inspire them with all the emulation of companionship with their Master. The nature of much of the tutorship at the universities is too well indicated by the idea which prevails of the character of the 'Don,' which implies distance and superiority. Jowett, it is observable, had a strong sense of the dignity of his position, and objected to the familiarity with undergraduates which he thought he noticed in one of the best tutors of Balliol. But he made the young men feel that he was one with them in the serious work of their lives. He was, perhaps, in great measure stimulated in this career by one 'infirmity of noble minds'—or, if not an infirmity, yet a danger, which may have been partly the source of some of his errors—the love of

influence and power, and its accompanying ambition. He says, about 1880, 'I grow more ambitious every year. All my time, money, thoughts, I would like to devote to gaining influence of the best kind, and an increasing influence yearly' (ii. 189).

'Search then the Ruling Passion : there alone
The wise are constant.'

This ruling passion evidently animated the greater part of Jowett's career, and grew stronger in him to the last ; and it is doubtless the explanation of that which, as we shall see, was the most unsatisfactory part of his conduct—his retention of his position in the Church, notwithstanding his conscious abandonment of its beliefs. But for that, though we cannot regard such a passion as the highest of all motives, its aim was an honourable one, and was pursued with rare singleness of purpose. From whatever motive, it were much to be wished that Jowett's example of devotion to the work of influencing the undergraduates of his College were more generally followed. We fear that undergraduates, even when men of promise, are not often sensible of a 'pastoral supervision,' such as the Warden of Merton describes in Jowett. He is spoken of in this period of his career as 'The Great Tutor ;' and the debt which his College and his pupils owe him in this respect explains the regard in which he was held to the last, and their overlooking of his great fault in another respect. A passage in the reminiscences of Lord Farrer (i. 66) well illustrates Jowett's whole position in those respects :

'If I were to attempt to characterize in a few words the effect which Jowett's personality had upon me through life, in our latest visits to one another as well as in those early days of Balliol, I should say that it was stimulating rather than formative. His instruction was not the explanation of a system of thought, or the communication of cut and dried propositions, but the opening of a vista which you were to follow up yourself. He had the Socratic art of saying to youthful eagerness, "Are you sure you are right?" but of saying it in such a manner as to develop zeal in the pursuit of truth. He discouraged dogmatism ; he encouraged thought. Perhaps this temper of mind was at a later period fostered by what I always felt to be his somewhat equivocal position with respect to the Church and Church doctrines ; a relation which, while in some respects it gave him great power, I have often wished otherwise. But however this may be, I have always felt from those early undergraduate days down to the last visit I paid him at Balliol in 1893, that his effect on me was one of the most invaluable services one man can render to another, viz. the stimulation of mental and moral energy—of ἐνέργεια ψυχῆς

κατ' ἀρ-
τελείῃ ('

This se-
influenc-
to us t-
error a-

Con-
tioned
by whi-
influen-
the val-
pleased
him :

'He
character-
forms o-
as a te-
early co-
pupils v-
of life"

In fact
to him
elemen-
this lif-
degree
observ-
remark-
had a
of the
human
he res-
ever-p-
faith.
near th-

'Sa-
to be s-
would
specul-
Trench-
vailing
above
all his
he wo-
wish it

H

κατ' ἀρετήν, and he would gladly have added himself—ἐν βίῳ τελείῳ ("a complete existence").

This seems to us a singularly just description of Jowett's influence as a tutor; and the words we have italicized appear to us to indicate at once the nature and the source of his error and his fault.

Connected with this influence as a tutor should be mentioned the remarkable vein of practical and worldly wisdom by which his mind was marked. His love of power and influence was naturally associated with an appreciation of the value of success in this world, which sometimes scarcely pleased his friends. This the Warden of Merton says of him:

'He never affected or specially admired an "unworldly" character. Though no man was ever less actuated by the lower forms of ambition, he was always disposed to regard worldly success as a test of merit in a sense against which I rebel, and in one of my early conversations with him, he expressed an earnest hope that his pupils would not, like those of another great teacher, "make a mess of life"' (i. 263).

In fact, as will be shown in the sequel, the other world was to him too dim and uncertain to be the main and determining element in his thoughts; but for the affairs and characters of this life he had the eye of an acute man of the world, in a degree rarely seen in his profession. The shrewdness of his observations on men and things throughout his life is most remarkable. He was an ardent admirer of Dr. Johnson, and had a keen appreciation of the best characteristics of the life of the eighteenth century—its practical wisdom, its strong human interest. In several respects, as the editors observe, he resembles Johnson, though without Johnson's deep and ever-present sense of the mysterious realities of the Christian faith. His sketches of character are sometimes amusingly near the mark. Thus:

'Samuel of Oxford is not unpleasing, if you will resign yourself to be semi-humbugged by a semi-humbug. He was very kind, and would do great good if he could but be persuaded to keep off speculative matters. In the latter respect Mauricianism, diluted by Trench, and still further watered by himself, seems to be the prevailing tone. But he is a man of the world and a gentleman, and above all "head of a house" delusions. . . . Nevertheless, with all his practical ability he shows weakness of character—e.g. he said he would print his Charge if we wished it; but some of us did not wish it, so the Charge was not printed' (i. 120).

Here, again, is a sentence which exactly describes one of

the great characters of Church history: 'Any scheme . . . must be done by some great doer of the age, who is able to act out the discovery of a truth through all its stages, and who does not get too soon convinced of the whole truth' (i. 149). That is the secret of Luther's work in a nutshell, so far as its external character is concerned. He had a wholesome distrust of metaphysics, which he retained even when the late Mr. T. H. Green was one of the honours and chief influences of Balliol.

'I confess,' he says (i. 160), 'I begin to look upon metaphysics rather as a necessity than as a great good—the air is too rarefied to breathe long, and you are like a balloon, a good deal at the mercy of the currents.' 'Metaphysics,' he said again (ii. 109), 'exercise a fatal influence over the mind in destroying the power of observation and of acquiring knowledge. They make the mind too large to take in small things. . . . This plague of metaphysics is as bad as the plague of logic among the Greeks. . . . Metaphysics should be sparingly introduced into education, and not too soon. Some boys want it, others are too much inclined to it.'

He had himself been much influenced by Hegel; but his practical turn of mind gave him so strong a feeling on this subject that he checked the work of T. H. Green at Balliol.

'On this point,' say the editors, 'he and Green must needs differ, and Green very wisely and generously gave way. For a year or two before he became professor, he took but a small share in the teaching of the college.'

From the same practical acuteness he saw through the danger of Mr. Gladstone's subtlety, and there has been no better appreciation of the great Liberal leader than in these words:

'I don't at present intend to vote for Gladstone, because not agreeing with him either about University Reform or Church and State. Also I feel a strong dislike to that over-conscientiousness of his, which, instead of walking in the great highway of political truth and honesty, is always winding round to his own interest and coming out at odd places where nobody expects him. Were it not for this, I think him a noble fellow; at present he is too good to be trusted. I dare say, however, that Temple is right in trying to tie him up with the coil of his own tail' (i. 223).

Even on a subject such as the duties of a great landlord, he writes to the present Marquis of Lansdowne in a spirit which recalls the account by the present Duke of Bedford of the management of the Bedford estates:

'You will probably hold your estates for fifty years, in which

time al
the hou
which o
have a
trouble
to mak
spent u

So

'To
man, th
be a c
conceal
a word
285).

Pe
racteri
He ex
almost
the co
the th
reader
up his

'As
ture of
all thin
a soun
He tho
in Gre
brough
often s
becaus
though
remov
his av
years.
But sc
Jowett
He wis
with th
tions.
he wor
Englis
be arr
means
if we
read w
413).

time almost everything may be accomplished for the agriculture, for the houses, and above all for the people. . . . There is another thing which occurs to me to say to you. It is of great importance if you have a large property to know all about it with the least possible trouble. And with this view I would train all the people I employed to make returns of the state of the farms, houses, schools, and sums spent upon them' (i. 434).

Sometimes his worldly wisdom recalls Lord Chesterfield.

'To do much good,' he says, 'you must be a very able and honest man, thinking of nothing else day and night; and you must also be a considerable piece of a rogue, having many reticences and concealments: and I believe a good sort of roguery is never to say a word against anybody, however much they may deserve it' (ii. 285).

Perhaps it is this practical habit which is the chief characteristic of his work as a scholar and as a Greek professor. He expresses again and again a wholesome indifference, and almost contempt, for the pettinesses of scholarship, and for the conjectural work of emendation; his object was to make the thoughts of great writers the common property of English readers; and the editors have, we think, very justly summed up his work in this respect:

'As Professor of Greek, Jowett felt that the language and literature of Greece were a trust committed to his care. He desired above all things to see the study of Greek placed on what he thought to be a sound basis, and pursued in a manner likely to produce good fruit. He thought that little could be done in elucidating difficult passages in Greek authors; in spite of all the ingenuity which had been brought to bear on them, the interpretation was still uncertain. He often spoke of Greek as the most difficult language in the world, not because our texts were corrupt, but owing to the subtlety of the thought, and the unfamiliar associations of words. The attempt to remove such difficulties by "emendation" was to him intolerable, and his aversion to this "curse of Greek scholarship" increased with years. He would have nothing to do with such *novæ tabule*. . . . But scholarship in the stricter sense of the word was only a part of Jowett's Greek studies, and by no means the most important part. He wished to see Greek ideas in contact with modern, and it was with this view that he insisted so strongly on the value of translations. That much is lost in translating from one language to another, he would readily have confessed; none knew better than he that English words have not the same associations as Greek, and cannot be arranged in the same order. Yet a translation is still the best means of introducing the Greek author to the English reader; and if we wish to know what the Greeks really thought, it is better to read what they wrote than what has been written about them' (ii. 413).

It seemed not only just but necessary to dwell on these general characteristics of Jowett's mind and work, for they throw a great light on the subject with which we are mainly concerned—his religious position and theological views. It is with regret we turn from contemplating him in the character of a 'Great Tutor,' an able man of business, a staunch friend, an affectionate and self-sacrificing son and brother, to review his action and influence in the most important of all fields. This seems to us to be in a great degree accounted for by the predominantly practical and businesslike character of his mind. He did not like mystery or mysticism, or anything that was not capable of being brought within the range of this world's observation and judgment. Even his admiration for Plato is no exception to this aspect of his mind. His editors quote, as illustrating the attraction which Plato had for him, 'the words in which he takes leave of the teacher with whom he has lingered so long :'

'More than two thousand years have passed away since Plato returned to the place of Apollo and the Muses. Yet the echo of his words continues to be heard among men because of all philosophers he has the most melodious voice. He is the inspired prophet or teacher who can never die, the only one in whom the outward form adequately represents the fair soul within ; in whom the thoughts of all who went before him are reflected, and of all who come after him are partly anticipated. Other teachers of philosophy are dried up and withered. After a few centuries they have become dust ; but he is fresh and blooming, and is always begetting new ideas in the minds of men. They are one-sided and abstract, but he has many sides of wisdom. Nor is he always consistent with himself, because he is always moving onwards, and knows that there are many more things in philosophy than can be expressed in words, and that truth is greater than consistency' (ii. 406).

In other words, his attraction to Plato was that he was a beautiful writer, that he was suggestive, tentative, and not abstract. It is not that Plato is the revealer to him of the great eternal truths which have ever been associated with the philosopher's name, but because he is melodious and undogmatic. As the editors say :

'with such methods, Jowett had the greatest sympathy. He knew that on many subjects certainty was impossible ; he disliked systems and formulæ. . . . Every system has its day, and ceases to be ; it is but a broken part of the whole, which is greater than all systems. Of this whole Jowett strove never to lose sight ; and here, once more, he was in sympathy with Plato.'

Accordingly the editors justly observe of his work in editing Plato and in his introductions to the *Dialogues* :

'He
system
about
ings ;
pierce
ideas a
that his
justice

In oth
the pr
though
with h
editors

'To
various
all that
such pi
ship, of
philosophy
times b
the two
ence, and

It i
hithert
myster
melodi
idealize
saw in
editors
of his
attracti
found a
brings
transce
perienc
ordinar
a solver
which
moralis

The
function
in the
volume
explain
bued w
VOL.

'He was more critical than speculative, more intuitive than systematic. Many penetrating and sagacious aphorisms, especially about psychological and ethical matters, will be found in his writings; from many sides he casts keen glances on his subject which pierce to the heart of it, but he did not attempt to correlate his own ideas and bring them into a system. And perhaps it may be said that his sense of the practical was too keen to allow him to do justice to a philosopher who was primarily a philosopher' (ii. 408).

In other words, that which attracted Jowett in Plato was not the profound philosophical truths which underlie Plato's thought, but Plato's critical and practical aspect, combined with his power of idealizing practical experience. As his editors again express it:

'To "idealize experience," to print fair pictures of life in its various relations and vocations—in this lay Jowett's strength. In all that he said or wrote; in his sermons, and speeches, and essays, such pictures abounded, pictures of love and marriage and friendship, of law and religion, pictures of the statesman, and poet, and philosopher, and scholar. Even in his conversation he would sometimes bring himself and his hearers back to them. They satisfied the twofold demands of his philosophy—the ideal elevating experience, and experience correcting the ideal' (ii. 412).

It is a strange anomaly to see the philosopher, who has hitherto been deemed the teacher of the loftiest and most mysterious speculative ideas, brought down to earth as the melodious artist, the suggestive and tentative critic, the idealizer of daily experience. That was what Jowett chiefly saw in Shakespeare, in the judgment of his very competent editors; and it is eminently and profoundly characteristic of his theological position. In just the same way the attraction of Christianity to him is not that it reveals profound and mysterious realities of our spiritual being, that it brings us into contact with living beings and forces of transcendent greatness, but, mainly, that it 'idealizes experience,' that it holds up before us elevated ideas of our ordinary life, while at the same time, like Plato, it acts as a solvent upon the dogmatic traditions and abstract systems, which it is the tendency of theologians and theological moralists to maintain.

The growth of this conception of Christianity and of its function may be traced gradually, and with increasing strength, in the account given by Jowett's own letters in these two volumes of his religious opinions. He sprang, as his editors explain with strange tediousness, from a family deeply imbued with the influences of the Evangelical school and of

Methodism. 'The names of Whitefield and Wesley, of Henry Venn, John Newton, Isaac Milner, Farish, Simeon, Robinson of Leicester, are household words to this family.' This, as the editors observe, renders it natural

'that the Master should have delighted always in religious biographies—that when most suspected of heresy, he should have heartily joined with private friends in singing simple hymns—that to the sentimentalities of more recent hymnody he greatly preferred Dr. Watts's version of the Ninetieth Psalm—or that in his latest years he should have delighted in commemorating Richard Baxter and John Wesley from the pulpit of Westminster Abbey' (i. 12.)

But at the time when he went to Oxford, in 1836, and when his mind was opening, the last influences of the Evangelical movement were on the wane. 'It seemed to him that its early spirituality had faded, and that an overgrowth of mingled cant and wordliness was stifling its vitality.' On the other side, he was brought into close contact at Oxford with the strange transformation scene of the Tractarian Movement between 1840 and 1850. One of the lecturers at Balliol when he became an undergraduate was W. G. Ward. That strange and powerful individuality had not yet taken its 'final bent, and the communication of his questionings and mental struggles, in many a dialectic argument, produced a strong effect upon young Jowett's mind.' One of the note-books of his thoughts, which he kept throughout his life, belongs to this period, and contains the heads of discussions on Subscription, on the Relation of Tradition to Scripture, on the respect due to our Mother Church, on Prayers for the Dead, on Romanism and Rationalism, Romanism and Evangelicalism, on the Patristic System, the Power of the Keys, Absolution, the *Via Media*; showing that his mind was exercised with all the theological controversies which were then setting Oxford and England on fire. Some of his remarks respecting them are marked by great acuteness, as, for instance (i. 79), that 'both Romanism and Rationalism are founded in great measure on metaphysical speculations, one of the Schoolmen, the other of German philosophy.' He himself said :

'I sometimes think that but for some Divine Providence I might have become a Roman Catholic. I had resolved to read through the Fathers, and if I found Puseyism there, I was to become a Puseyite. It is not unlikely that I might have found it, but before I had gone through my task the vacation ended, and on returning to Oxford we found that Ward was going to be married! After that the Tractarian impulse subsided and while some of us took to

Ger-
pagn

The
prod
soon

'T
call th
drawn
be ma
I thin
has th
most
retirin
has fo
annou
indefe
the sp
concep
mocki

Jo
situat
which
eyes.
bably
men v
of the
disillu
and w

An
religio
He wa
Fellow
by Ne
Jowett
oblig
began
editors
been a
getting
of the
to stru
would
templa
from th
driven

German philosophy, others turned to lobster suppers and champagne. They called that "being unworldly" (i. 74).

The practical collapse of Ward's grand ideal seems to have produced a great impression on Jowett. He wrote to a friend soon after the event :

'The tragedy is now at an end, and the comedy, or what I must call the *tragi-comedy*, is about to begin ; but the curtain is not yet drawn up for the public. . . . In a word, our Confessor is going to be married. I do not, of course, blame Ward for this in itself, but I think he is very much to blame for recklessly writing a book which has thrown us into confusion, and then doing precisely the thing most inconsistent with his own principles ; and lastly, instead of retiring from the contest as he ought under the circumstances, he has fought it out to the last. Either he felt himself called upon to announce a high and important truth, or his book is absolutely indefensible. A man in love is not exactly the person to breathe the spirit of Hildebrand or Innocent. I believe he has not the least conception of the ludicrous point of view which he will present to a mocking world, and am truly sorry for it for his sake' (i. 95).

Jowett's keen practical sense saw the falseness of the situation at once, and the glamour was at once dissipated which High Church principles might have possessed in his eyes. It is true the same too practical instinct would, probably, sooner or later have prevented his cordially joining men who were mainly concerned to assert the great mysteries of the Christian Creed and the Christian Church ; but the disillusion might not have come so soon, or so sharply, and with such decided consequences.

Another memorable event which deeply affected Jowett's religious position was the publication, in 1841, of Tract XC. He was a young man then, just beginning his career as a Fellow of Balliol, and it is evident that the position adopted by Newman and his followers towards the Articles undermined Jowett's sense of the moral, as distinct from the legal, obligation involved in subscription. In May of that year he began a series of 'Notes' on the subject, from which the editors quote some remarkable passages. He seems to have been at the moment in favour of the Erastian process of getting the articles simplified and reimposed by the authority of the State. 'This,' he says, 'seems really the practical thing to struggle for' (i. 75) ; but with a little longer experience he would hardly have faced so coolly the contingency he contemplates :—'If it be said it would drive many good men from the Church, it can only be replied that good men were driven out at the Restoration, and that we are apt to estimate

the evil to religion by the extent of evil to our personal friends.' But Newman's sophistry had done its work on his mind.

'It may be said,' he proceeds (i. 76), "'Why not take them, as all good men do, in their obvious sense?' Because this is impossible. The Articles are irreconcilable with the Liturgy if both are taken in their most obvious sense: both being equally imposed on the clergy.

'Again, it may not be denied that some license is allowable—it cannot be supposed that all the propositions in the Articles were to be taken in their fullest sense. But where can we draw the line about this license, especially as every man sees the Articles through his own spectacles?'

And once more, supposing the Articles to be imposed by the State,

'we should be only obliged to take the test in the letter as we should obey a law. . . . No one can say we are bound to carry out in its full spirit a law we conceive to be indefensible.'

Thus, at the outset of his career, Jowett's sense, to say the least, of any plain moral obligation in subscription to the formularies of the Church was fatally shaken; his earliest theological prepossessions had received a rude shock, and he entered upon the theological speculations of his life without the guidance of any authority which he trusted. At the same time another influence was at work, which, on an acute and too purely intellectual nature, thus cut loose from any authoritative influence, could not fail to act as a dangerous solvent. His 'Notes' of the same period contain a passage 'on Strauss's theory of Christianity.' At this time he recognizes (i. 78) that 'the *a priori* truth which is supposed to be self-evident, and which all those systems are intended to support, is the subordination of Christianity to German Philosophy,' and he observes it would be a theory much more plausible than that of Strauss, which treats the details of the Gospel history as mythical, to 'speak of Christianity as an inspired myth.' For the moment his common sense and his inherited belief rejected not only the pretentious theories but the principles of Strauss; but the influence was at work. He mentions that his first anxieties respecting the historical trustworthiness of the Gospels were awakened by his introduction to Niebuhr's criticism of Roman history in the lecture-room of one of his tutors. Through Stanley, who was his intimate friend at this time, he was of course brought into contact with Arnold's influence, and it appears that at his ordination to the priesthood, he asked the Bishop of Oxford whether he thought that

Arn
S. V
much
havi
he b
sever
pend
inde
'The
(i. 26
who
not
comm
it wa
he re
of Jo
from
Engl
and i

It
now
seem
sense
a som
of Ch
'y
your t
about
for rel
the Au
morall
lose b
life? A
an inc
(i. 86).

W
of a m
to wh
less in
measu
later,

'C
very de
propor
about

Arnold was justified in signing the Articles, and the Bishop, S. Wilberforce, replied 'Yes.' But there is not otherwise much trace of Arnold's strong and decided theological views having made much impression upon him. In 1842, however, he began the study of Hegel, and the editors tell us that for several years after this he remained an ardent, though independent, student of that philosopher. But in spite of this independence, it is clear that Hegel influenced him greatly. 'The study of Hegel,' he used to say, 'has given me a method' (i. 261), and he expressed his agreement (ii. 250) with a friend who observed that 'the influence of Hegel's philosophy could not wholly pass away, because his ideas have become the common property of all who care about philosophy.' But it was from Hegel that Strauss and the ideological movement he represented took their start. So, step by step, the mind of Jowett on theological and religious matters was loosened from its hold on the objective and dogmatic moorings of English Churchmen, and was launched on the sea of critical and ideological speculation.

It is melancholy to follow the track along which his mind now drifted. In 1844, in a remarkable letter to a friend who seemed inclined to materialism, while expressing the strong sense he entertained of the importance of religion, he indicates a somewhat indifferent attitude towards some cardinal points of Christian belief, and says :

'What appears to me to make the greatest gulf between us is not your taking a rationalistic or mythic view of the Bible, or difficulties about miracles, or even prayer, but that you do not leave any place for religion at all, so that though you may hold the being of God as the Author of the Universe, I do not see how you would be worse off morally if Atheism were proved to demonstration. What would you lose but a little poetry, which is a very weak motive to holiness of life? And having shut yourself out from any moral relation to God as an incentive to Duty, does this moral Atheism satisfy human nature?' (i. 86).

We shall see that, towards the close of his life, this sense of a moral relation to God remains the one religious anchor to which he trusted, all the other points which he thought of less importance in dividing him from his friend being in great measure surrendered. But writing to the same friend a year later, he again expresses his deep feeling on the subject :

'Concerning matters serious, allow me to say one word. I feel very deeply that it is impossible to live without religion, and that in proportion as we believe less, that little, if it be only an awful feeling about existence, must be more constantly present with us ; as faith

loses in extent it must gain in intensity, if we do not mean to shipwreck altogether. I go about from one subject to another just as if we were talking together, and am well aware how feeble and unmeaning my words are to bring us to any further agreement on these subjects, but I cannot help often thinking about you, and sometimes—it is at least a harmless superstition—remembering you in prayer' (i. 115).

It is sad to find him writing in his 'Notes,' at a later date, about 1880 :

'Morning and evening prayers are almost impossible to me. Church is difficult. But I desire more and more never to let a day pass without some idea or aspiration arising in my mind. And this appears to be retained. I am always thinking of death and of God, and of the improvement of human nature, though sometimes interrupted by false and petty conceits of self' (ii. 190).

In such a confession he is not far removed from the state of mind against which he warned his friend in 1845. But in the first attack of his fatal illness in 1891 his religious consciousness of the moral relation of the soul to God revives, and he pens the following touching prayer :

'Grant, Lord, that we may have age without pain, and death without suffering ; that we may love Thee, and be resigned to Thy Will, and may acknowledge Thy laws to be in all things the rule of our life. Let us say in our hearts, "The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want. Yea, though I walk through the valley of death I will fear no evil ; for Thou art with me ; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me." Make us to think in the hour of death of the sufferings of others rather than of our own, and let us not forget that there are blessings reserved for us greater than any pains and suffering. Give us peace, O Lord, in the hour of our agony, and let us thank Thee for having made suffering possible to us' (ii. 366).

But although he retained his hold on these elemental principles of religion to the last, the memoir reveals unmistakably a gradual surrender of the characteristic and essential principles of Christianity. The centre of Christianity is the Person of Christ, and a man's relation to Christianity must mainly be determined by his belief respecting Christ, and his consequent relation to Him. It is with respect to this momentous point that the development of Jowett's position is most marked. The starting-point may be taken from some essays which the editors mention as extant among his papers, but not published, and written between 1846 and 1850 (i. 137). One essay is on 'The Person of Christ,' which they describe as 'an extremely subtle, but hardly a satisfactory piece of work.' They say that

'Tra
app
heari
never
which
surro

The
belie
it ;
tion.
Ano
Sept

the li
unple
and C
pretin

To s
our f
is, in
Chris
requ
Cree
the l
state
the
Bam
soun
theol
and s

I
he ha
all th
able
bear
had
the q
logic
mora
seem
perso
nothi
forth
the r
woul

'Traditional orthodoxy is sublimated and held in solution by an application of Hegelian method. The feeling with which, on hearing it said that Christ was merely human, he answered, "I shall never say that," is there in full intensity, but is expressed in forms which retain a savour of scholasticism. The "golden haze" is still surrounding him; he does not yet "look out on the open heaven."'

The 'golden haze,' we presume, in plain language, is the belief of the Church respecting our Lord, or a hazy form of it; 'the open heaven' is the view of it without that illumination. The editors say that it marks 'a moment of transition.' Another stage is marked in a letter to Lord Lingen in September 1846, in which he says:

'It is impossible that we can have the faith of our fathers, because the light is always breaking in upon us. . . . Think of how many unpleasant truths there are that remain untold about Christianity and Christendom, and yet we all give an implied assent to interpreting the Gospel by the course of the world' (i. 156).

To say that 'it is impossible that we should have the faith of our fathers because the light is always breaking in upon us,' is, in effect, to surrender the Christian position. To a Christian there is no more reason why further light should require us to change our faith in the cardinal truths of the Creed than why it should require us to change our belief in the law of gravitation. The cardinal Christian doctrines are statements of facts, and must remain as unchangeable as the facts themselves. Soon after this Mr. H. B. Wilson's Bampton Lectures, in 1851, are noted by the editors as sounding the 'first clear note of a demand for freedom in theological inquiry, a demand which was destined to grow and strengthen for years to come.'

In the opinion of his biographers it was about 1854 that he had reached a point of view 'from which, while retaining all that seemed essential in the traditions of the past, he felt able to bring the spiritual principles involved in them to bear with fresh significance on the life of the present.' He had come to the charitable conclusion which he expressed in the question to Stanley of 1846 (i. 227): 'Is there one theological writer of the present day who can be said to be morally and intellectually truthful?' 'The mournful fact' seemed consequently forced upon him 'that there is no elder person in whose footsteps one can tread, however little or nothing it is possible for us to do.' He is therefore henceforth pursuing his theological course alone, and undertaking the responsibility of a leader. But he led very cautiously, and would do nothing to forfeit a position which gave him the

'influence' he desired to exercise. He inculcated the same questionable caution on the young men who followed him. To one of them he writes (i. 262): 'I was sorry to hear that you had got a reputation for heterodoxy with Mr. —. Will you be careful of this? A young man is in great danger of becoming powerless who is shelved in this way.' In this spirit he wrote to Dean Elliot, who thought of giving up the Prolocutorship because 'Convocation was so unjust' (i. 355): 'I think it is an error (and one which is almost sure to cause pain in the retrospect) to retire from any position in which you have attained success and honour. Never resign, especially in the Church, where such a magic power attends the words of any person in authority. It is true that you cannot say so much, but what you say has tenfold weight and power.' The spirit in which he approached theology is well illustrated in a letter to another young friend about this date (i. 359): 'I do not know that you care to plunge into the abyss of theology. But I shall always maintain that there is no abyss, and that, without relying on fables or fancies, any who will may find their way through this world with sufficient knowledge to light them to another.' To bridge over all the abysses of thought, the great gulfs which divide, and always have divided, great philosophers and great theologians from one another, and to render everything plain in the light of common day, is throughout Jowett's tendency as a practical man. Whoever approaches Christianity and religion in this spirit must needs rationalize away its most characteristic truths; and this is the process which we trace steadily going forward with Jowett in the sequel.

In 1863 the publication of Renan's *Vie de Jésus* elicits from him some sensible criticism in a letter to Mrs. Tennyson, as, for instance, that

'the Christ with which Renan presents us appears to me to be essentially a "French" Christ, with some traits in Him from Renan's own character' (i. 363).

But he concludes with the ominous observation that

'the book, though very far from presenting the ultimate truth in which the world will rest, is very significant of the change which is coming over the Christian Faith. May we be prepared to meet it.'

In other words, instead of feeling any repugnance to Renan's account of our Lord, he accepts it as a step forward. His tendency is more and more to treat the value of the Gospels, considered as a faithful record of the facts of our Lord's life, as damaged by criticism, in the same way as he thought the

Pent
life a
ing t

Chris
it, th
to pla
not a
(ii. 3)

Wha
tiani
room
such
close
Chris
his m

'
then,
must
us, li
us.
And
ideal
not S
of Hi
How
of hu

Agai

'If th
count
truths
and a

T
not
Test
quote
admi
be m
super
of th
gone
a life
even
poran

Pentateuch had been, and consequently to treat our Lord's life and words simply as convenient instruments for inculcating the higher human ideals. Thus he writes about 1871 :

'It is not with the very words of Christ, but with the best form of Christianity, as the world has made it, or can make it, or will receive it, that we are concerned to-day. There is an ideal which we have to place before us intimately connected with practical life—nothing if not a life—which may be conveniently spoken of as the life of Christ' (ii. 30).

What a descent ! From 'the very words of Christ' to Christianity 'as the world has made it or can make it !' What room remained for a real theology or a real Church under such a conception ? No wonder that, as he lamented at the close of his life, it had not been given him to write a 'Life of Christ,' as he had often contemplated. A little later one of his memoranda gives us his thoughts on this supreme subject :

'An ideal necessarily mingles with all conceptions of Christ ; why, then, should we object to a Christ who is necessarily ideal ? . . . We must accept the fact that the life of Christ is only partially known to us, like that of other great teachers of religion. And this is best for us. We have enough to assist us, but not enough to constrain us. And upon this basis the thoughts of men in many ages may raise an ideal more perfect than any actual conception of Him. . . . Did not St. Paul idealize Christ ? Do we suppose that all which he says of Him is simply matter of fact, and known to St. Paul as such ? . . . How far can we individualize Christ, or is He only the perfect image of humanity ?' (ii. 85).

Again :

'If the life of Christ is ever written over again in our own age and country, it should not be as a history of wonders, but as a history of truths which seem to be always fading away before the eyes of men, and are always needing to be revived' (ii. 85).

Thirty years before he had written to Stanley : 'I have not any tendency to doubt about the miracles of the New Testament.' But now, at the same time as the passages just quoted on the life of Christ, he says : 'Whether we like to admit it or not, the belief in miracles is fading away, and can only be maintained by a violent effort, which must revive many other superstitions' (ii. 87). So, by this time, the historical basis of the belief of the Christian Church respecting our Lord is gone. Not only must the belief in miracles be given up, and a life of Christ no longer written as a story of wonders, but even what is said of our Lord by St. Paul, his contemporary, cannot be taken as matter of fact, or known to St. Paul

as such. It was inevitable that this course of thought should lead to the lamentable confession which he records in his own Note-book in 1879. Among his favourite books, we are told, was the *De Imitatione Christi*, which took rank with Baxter's *Saint's Rest*, St. Augustine's *Confessions*, and Bunyan's *Grace Abounding*. But after reading it again in that year he writes as follows :

'Is it possible to feel a personal attachment to Christ such as is prescribed by Thomas à Kempis? I think that it is impossible and contrary to human nature that we should be able to concentrate our thoughts on a person scarcely known to us, who lived 1800 years ago. But there might be such a passionate longing and yearning for goodness and truth. The personal Christ might become the ideal Christ, and this would easily pass into the idea of goodness' (ii. 151).

It is surely astounding that a man should say it is 'impossible and contrary to human nature' that we should feel a personal attachment to Christ, when he is fresh from reading a book which is wholly based on that attachment, and which has been the treasure of the world, ever since it was written, because it gives such expression to that attachment. But when a man has deliberately recorded the conviction that it is impossible to feel a personal attachment to Christ because He is scarcely known to us, it is evident that he has given up the essential condition of being a Christian. It was not Thomas à Kempis, but an apostle, who said of the relation of Christians to our Lord, '*Whom having not seen, ye love, in Whom though now ye see Him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.*' The concluding chapters of St. John, which were always a favourite passage with Jowett, are instinct with this sense of the personal relation and affection between our Lord and His disciples ; and that a man whose mind was familiar with those chapters should speak of our Lord being scarcely known to us, and of attachment to Him being impossible, is an extraordinary instance of the mystifying and blinding tendency of such speculations as had laid hold on Jowett's mind. But the whole character of his observations on theology and religion is in harmony with this confession. Christ as a living person to whom the soul is personally attached, and on whose real and actual work it depends, is nowhere, even in the deeper moments of his closing hours, present to Jowett's mind. His religion, in fact, becomes a Deism—an earnest Deism—but still no more. The living Christ, respecting whom Keble expressed the essential feeling of the Christian when he wrote :

beco
good
mak
come
of th
by a
is al
on t
year
deep
volti
viole
That
Thom
perso
not s
is of
reali
A
of th
grap
whic
Nor
e.g. n
also t
we sh
age, a
absur
ness
pass
antec
a dea
God
(ii. 3)

'Sun of my soul, thou Saviour dear,
It is not night if Thou be near ;
Oh, may no earth-bound cloud arise
To hide Thee from Thy servant's eyes,'

becomes 'scarcely known,' and is sublimated into an ideal of goodness and beauty 'such as the world has made it or may make it!' Whatever the beliefs may be of a man who has come to this conclusion respecting Christ, they are destitute of the characteristic element of Christianity, and he is divided by a deep gulf from the faith and the life of the Church. It is almost a deeper bathos when he adds to these reflections on the *De Imitatione*: 'Is it possible for me, perhaps ten years hence, to write a new Thomas à Kempis, going as deeply into the foundations of human life, and yet not revolting the common sense of the nineteenth century by his violent contrast between this world and another?' (ii. 152). That it should be conceived possible to go as deeply as Thomas à Kempis into the foundations of life without a personal attachment to Christ, and under the condition of not shocking 'the common sense of the nineteenth century,' is of itself enough to condemn a man's apprehension of such realities as hopelessly shallow.

After this, we may pass over subsequent exemplifications of the same rationalistic views, and come to what his biographers describe as 'his last reflections on the subject to which he had devoted so much of his life:—'

'This is the age of facts, and facts are now too strong for ideas. Nor shall we ever return to the belief in facts which are disproved, e.g. miracles, the narratives of creation, of Mount Sinai. And this is also the age of criticism, and criticism is too strong for dogma. And we shall never return to the belief in dogmas, which belong to another age, and to ourselves are mere words . . .

'What is the possible limit of changes in the Christian religion?

'1. The conception of miracles may become impossible and absurd.

'2. The hope of immortality may be only the present consciousness of goodness and of God.

'3. The personality of God, like the immortality of men, may pass into an idea.

'4. Every moral act may be acknowledged to have a physical antecedent.

'5. Doctrines may become unmeaning words.

'Yet the essence of religion may still be self-sacrifice, self-denial, a death unto life, having for its rule an absolute morality, a law of God and nature—a doctrine common to Plato and the Gospel' (ii. 310).

The final result, therefore, is not merely the impossibility and absurdity of miracles, but the surrender of any definite belief in immortality, in the personality of God, and in the meaning of any doctrines. He goes on to say that the new Christianity will involve, among other things,

'the sense that we know as much as Christ did, or might know, if we had given ourselves for men. . . . Neither St. Paul nor Christ really saw into a seventh heaven, or had any knowledge of a truth which can be described under the conditions of space and time different from our own. But they had a deeper and more intense conviction that all was well with them; that all things were working together for good; that mankind, if united to God and to one another, had the promise of the future in both worlds.'

There are, he adds, two great truths of religion :

'I. The sense and practice of the presence of God, the sight of Him and the knowledge of Him as the great overruling law of progress in the world, whether personal or impersonal. . . .

'II. . . . Resignation to the general facts of the world and of life. In Christianity we live, but Christianity is fast becoming one religion among many. We believe in a risen Christ, not risen, however, in the sense in which a drowning man is restored to life, not even in the sense in which a ghost is supposed to walk the earth, nor in any sense which we can define or explain.'

So the belief in the resurrection of our Lord, 'in any sense which we can define or explain,' goes the way of other miracles, and Christianity of course takes its place as one among many religions, and ceases to be the one final and eternal truth. Only one more quotation is requisite to complete this picture of Jowett's capitulation. He says of the Gospels, writing to Mrs. Humphry Ward in 1888: 'They are an unauthenticated fragment belonging to an age absolutely unknown, which is adduced as the witness of the most incredible things' (ii. 341). With that admission, of course, the basis of historical Christianity is gone.

Now it is not our business on this occasion to reply to all these anti-Christian statements and speculations, or to expose their shallowness and barrenness. But what we are concerned to ask is, by what right a man who had come, not only in mature, but in advanced, life to such conclusions, could retain positions in the Church and the world, to which he was admitted on the faith of his not only believing, but teaching, the very truths which in his heart and mind he thus absolutely repudiated? As Master of Balliol, he was responsible for the maintenance of services in the chapel, and of religious instruction, in which those truths were solemnly proclaimed

and
quo
cons
recit
whic
'the
plet
enor
one
thes
that
thus
nega
offic
posi
invi
as t
disb
this
dish
othe
and
youn
Chur
to co
truth
volun
of E
Dear
logic
intell
prof
ing l
exert
an au
which
Yet
oppr
becau
ackno
convic
Engla
falseh
again
Chur

and formally taught. No wonder that, in a passage already quoted, he should say he 'found Church difficult.' But was it consistent with truth and honesty that he should assist in the recitation of creeds, and the administration of Sacraments, which were the solemn declarations of what he regarded as 'the most incredible things'? It is not even as if he completely held his tongue, though that would have been bad enough. But as letters in these volumes show, as for instance one to the Marchioness of Tavistock (ii. 273), he disseminated these doubts among intimate friends, and he must have known that they would filter through them to other minds, and that thus his doubts and denials could hardly fail to extend their negative influence to the circle of those for whom, in his official position, he was directly responsible. Apart from his position at Balliol, with what sense of honesty could he accept invitations to preach in churches in London and the country, as the ordained representative of the truths he personally disbelieved and was privately undermining? His conduct in this respect seems to us to amount to a lamentable course of dishonesty, which must remain as a great stain on a character otherwise honourable and exemplary, and which has exerted, and is exerting, a demoralizing effect on the generation of young men who grew up under his influence, and on the Church of England at large. It is startling, and distressing, to compare with this conduct the reckless accusations of untruth and dishonesty which, in several passages in these volumes, he casts at his brother clergy and even at the Church of England at large. We have already quoted a letter to Dean Stanley, in which he asks whether there was one theological writer of the day who could be said to be morally and intellectually truthful. What was he himself, when he was professing to recite and to inculcate creeds which he was teaching ladies who trusted him to disbelieve, and when he was exerting, as a priest and preacher in the English Church, an authority given on condition of his acceptance of truths which, in his heart, he deliberately and utterly repudiated? Yet he was not ashamed, again and again, to use the most opprobrious language respecting his Church and his brethren because, as he thought, they were refusing publicly to acknowledge truths which they could not deny. 'I feel convinced,' he says, 'that sooner or later the Church of England will find it impossible to subsist as a fabric of falsehood and fiction' (i. 300). 'I am astonished,' he says again, 'at the carelessness about truth which there is in the Church of England' (i. 322). Speaking of the adversaries of

the Liberal movement, he says 'the position which we are likely to take up is the most hateful to them, that of religious men who care about the truth' (i. 442). A man who uses such language about his fellows in the ministry has no claim to an indulgent consideration himself, and we have no hesitation in saying that all his denunciations of untruth and dishonesty in others recoil with redoubled force on his own head, in presence of the contrast we have drawn between his position and his beliefs. He acted himself on the advice he gave to a clergyman who doubted whether his intellectual difficulties did not require his resignation of his office: 'If you sever yourself from the Church you are isolated and useless' (ii. 306). In order to retain that 'influence' which, as we have seen, was the chief object of Jowett's ambition, he allowed himself to act the part of a teacher of the Christian faith, although he had come to reject absolutely what had been the cardinal doctrines of that faith from the first days of the Church to the present time. His influence may be found in the great unsettlement of the moral obligations of subscription, which was occasioned in the first instance by the evasions of Tract XC., and which, in a very different instance, was condoned in the case of *Essays and Reviews*. He wrote to Dean Elliot in 1861:

'Unless you admit some freedom of thought, men of ability will be absolutely excluded, and the Church of England will become more and more the instrument of bigotry and intolerance. Moreover I cannot see that freethinkers about Scripture, &c., who were not contemplated by the Articles, are more nearly touched by them than the High Churchmen who were, or than the Evangelicals are by the Baptismal Service. Though I dislike subscription, I am inclined to think that if we are all dishonest together, that proves us to be all honest together' (i. 348).

The last words are an application of a paradox of W. G. Ward; and of course a general toleration of ambiguous subscription palliates, though it cannot justify, ambiguity on all sides. But there is a limit beyond which even this palliation is inadmissible; and Jowett, in the instances we have quoted, went beyond any possible limits. His divergence from the Creeds and Articles went the length of a denial of the central doctrines of the Faith, and it is a flagrant offence against public morality that he should have nevertheless clung to the positions he held, aggravated by the fact that he held on to those positions for the express purpose of exercising an influence in promoting his negative views.

We must ask, in conclusion, whether such a result of

Jowett
dissen
deep
the s
Review
at O
mann
was c
from
fourth
Church
avowed
by J
sion c
and t
men
men,
goes
admir
was u
young
who c
the m
and a
positi
again
which
to Fai
faith m
of the
marka
presse
only p
called
learned
'An
believe,
portion
portant,
this str
of Chris
truths—
indeed,
great te
represent
was givi

Jowett's views, and such a course of conduct on his part in disseminating them, be not a substantial justification for the deep suspicion entertained by the Church, from the outset, of the so-called Liberal movement revealed in *Essays and Reviews*, and for the distrust felt by the leaders of the Church, at Oxford and elsewhere, towards Jowett himself? The manner in which this distrust and suspicion were exhibited was often mistaken, and sometimes unjust (as will be seen from the account of the matter in the recently published fourth volume of Dr. Pusey's *Life*: see above, p. 280). But Churchmen were right in their instinct that the principles avowed in that volume, and promoted in the university by Jowett and his friends, led naturally to the subversion of the fundamental principles of the Christian Faith, and to the undermining of that faith among the young men of Oxford. The mischief which Jowett, above all men, has done in the latter respect is incalculable, and goes very far to neutralize the good which he did by his admirable labours as a tutor. The influence he acquired was used to unsettle the minds of several generations of young men, and has been extending far and wide. Those who desire to see a calm and searching examination of the method of thought which led Jowett to such results, and an equally calm and just estimate of the false moral position in which it placed him, would do well to read again the admirable Essay on 'Ideology and Subscription' which the late Canon Cook contributed to the volume of *Aids to Faith*, which was published as a support 'to those whose faith may have been shaken by recent assaults.' The Essay is of the more weight, in this connexion, in consequence of a remarkable opinion which Jowett is recorded as having expressed respecting Canon Cook. He said of him: 'He is the only person in England, whom I have met, that could be called really learned' (i. 271). This is what that really learned man says of the teaching of Strauss:

'And yet Strauss professes, and may be assumed actually to believe, that he retains the essential truths of Christianity. The last portion of his book, which he certainly regarded as the most important, is intended to draw out the eternal ideas which underlie this strange tissue of legend and myth. The supernatural nativity of Christ, His miracles, His resurrection and ascension, remain ideal truths—utterly separated as they are from objective facts. Christ, indeed, in His concrete personality, disappears from the system of the great teacher of Ideology. No individual does or can adequately represent, much less embody, absolute realities. But the Church was guided by a true instinct when, in the Person of Jesus, she found

an expression of those realities. In Him was manifested more perfectly than in any individual that which is the ultimate and substantial principle of all religion—the unity of God and man. . . . Instead of an individual we have an idea. In an individual the properties and functions which the Church attributes to Christ contradict themselves ; in the idea of the race they perfectly agree.’¹

Here, at the outset of the ideological movement in Strauss, we have, it will be seen, the very issue to which Jowett’s principles led him. As Canon Cook says further on :

‘It is only a question of time, of discretion in meddling with stubborn prejudices, how soon and how far the objective facts of an external positive revelation may be rejected, how the doctrines themselves may be remoulded, under the supreme and ultimate authority of the natural conscience, into accordance with the requirements of an enlightened age’ (p. 164).

A more exact account of Jowett’s methods and their result could not well be given ; but Canon Cook immediately goes on to ask, as we have done,

‘How is it possible that men of honour holding such opinions can retain, or endure, their position as ministers and teachers of a Church, which, liberal as it undoubtedly is in dealing with all questions about which believers in a positive revelation may conscientiously differ, has no less certainly pronounced a clear and decisive sentence upon each and all of the points controverted or denied by Ideologists?’ (p. 164).

It is mainly because, as he says,

‘it has lately been asserted, as I believe for the first time, that the moral obligation of the act of subscription is commensurate and identical with the legal obligation’ (p. 177),

and he exposes the absurdity of such a supposition :

‘The act of subscription would be superfluous if it did not super-add to the legal a perfectly, distinctly, and incomparably higher obligation—even one which binds the conscience of an honest man’ (p. 178).

Accordingly, he proceeds :

‘The laity will be prepared to allow time for consideration to any man harassed by perplexing doubts ; no man would be regarded with more entire sympathy and tenderness than one whose spirit might be overwrought in its struggles with storms which haunt the higher regions of intellectual life ; but so long as he works, prays, preaches, administers the Sacraments of the Church, or discharges the kindred and no less responsible duty of forming the character of

¹ *Aids to Faith*, p. 155.

youth
and w
tially
delibe
in tok

T
alway
Maste

AR

A C
a
M
(

THE S
furnish
factory
the ob
Intern
Mark-
perhap
subject
same s
Plumm
arms o
which
dealt
difficul
many
Comm
being
He urg
contin
that so
have l
which
Lastly
call an
that m
eyes m
VOL.

youth under the sanction of the ministerial office, laymen presume, and would be scandalized to hear it doubted, that he holds substantially the convictions which he professed, when formally, publicly, deliberately, at a most critical moment of his life, he signed his name in token of unfeigned assent to the Articles of his Church' (p. 180).

This is the grave and mischievous scandal which must always mar the otherwise honourable reputation of the late Master of Balliol.

ART. VIII.—DR. PLUMMER'S COMMENTARY
ON ST. LUKE.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke. By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A., D.D., Master of University College, Durham. (Edinburgh, 1896.)

THE Synoptic Gospels have not, up to the present time, been furnished with commentaries which can be considered satisfactory or final. In this respect they are far behind many of the other books of the New Testament. The volume in the International Critical Commentary, which dealt with St. Mark—though it is helpful in many points of exegesis—is perhaps the weakest of the series. The book which is the subject of the present article, is the last contribution to the same series from the pen of one of the three editors. Dr. Plummer, in his preface, anticipates and to some extent disarms criticism by appealing to the vastness of the literature which has gathered round the subject in monographs, which dealt with minute points in a minute way, and to the difficulty of keeping abreast of it. He also explains that many points have been intentionally omitted in view of a *Commentary on the Synopsis of the Four Gospels* which is being prepared for this series by Dr. Sanday and Mr. Allen. He urges, further, that considerations of space have had to be continually borne in mind. It might have been expected that some questions treated in the volume before us would have been left to the Commentary on the Synopsis, by which means further space would have been made available. Lastly Dr. Plummer, as editor, makes what we may almost call an appeal *ad misericordiam* to his readers on the ground that many omissions, misprints, &c., which a second pair of eyes might have detected, have probably escaped correction.

VOL. XLV.—NO. XC.

E E

Alas! we shall find this last point only too true, and the supply of *misericordia* must be almost inexhaustible, for in a scholarly book, such as this one is, probably few things are more irritating than to be met on almost every page with some misprint or wrong accent or breathing. We shall probably be doing a service if we collect those which we have noticed, that in a second edition they may be altered. Our list—which will be found *infra*, p. 419—will at any rate be an indication of the careful reading which his Commentary has received. And we may go on at once to say that we have found in it a great deal which is both interesting and suggestive, and calculated (in Dr. Plummer's words) to help forward 'the long process of eliciting from the inexhaustible storehouse of the Gospel narrative some of those things which it is intended to convey.' The special contributions which Dr. Plummer brings are to be found 'in the illustrations taken from Jewish writings, in the abundance of references to the Septuagint, and to the Acts and other books of the New Testament, in the frequent quotations of renderings in the Latin Versions, and in the attention which has been paid . . . to the marks of St. Luke's style.' This linguistic study of the Bible, which, by a process of induction, endeavours to arrive at the meaning of the writers, is often depreciated, and rightly so where it is made an end in itself and not a means to the exact and reverent study of the Word of God. We may at once admit that those who object to this close verbal study do well to call attention to its attendant dangers, especially in the religious teaching of the young. Too often, as the Head Master of Marlborough has recently pointed out, a discussion of the force of the aorist or the use of the negative is more congenial to the teacher than the religious teaching itself, and so takes its place. This, however, is not the case in Dr. Plummer's volume, and a (to us) novel feature—which might well find a place in every similar commentary, especially for school purposes—is the way in which it is shown that the old Roman creed, corresponding roughly to the Apostles' Creed, summarizes conveniently the things wherein Theophilus was instructed, and of the certainty of which he is assured. Those who attempt to depreciate or to eliminate dogma, must often be unconscious of the gigantic task which they so lightly set before themselves, even if they confine themselves to the Synoptic Gospels and the Acts, which we may regard as books primarily historical.

It may not be out of place to make a few remarks in reference to this general question of the principles which

are,
espo
men
sch
its t
and
be c
πισ
we
We
poru
Gree
to be
is in
may
gain
pass
Lord
of th
exac
St. L
exam
style,
word
Luke
origin
that t
quest
illustr
bears
St. L
mean
tation
of do
Greek
of the
to the

¹ St
April 1
tions w
tinguish
the oth
us from
ment C
'aoristi
infinitiv

are justifiable in dealing with the Greek of the New Testament, especially as one of the latest grammars of the New Testament, written by one of the best known German classical scholars, Friedrich Blass, seems to us somewhat retrograde in its tendency; as, for example, in its assertions that *ὁ πατήρ* and *ὁ πατήρ μου* as applied to God in St. John are not to be distinguished; nor again are *περί* and *ὑπέρ*; nor again has *πιστεύειν* with *ἐν*, *εἰς*, *ἐπὶ* the variations of meaning which we have been taught to associate with those constructions.¹ We cannot now go back to the doctrine of the *Enallage Temporum*, and because we find many departures from classical Greek alike in the forms and meanings of words, we are not to be asked to believe that the syntax of the New Testament is in all points *identical* with that of modern Greek. We may take two or three instances to show what fresh light is gained by a close study of the Greek, and that in important passages. The first shall be from the two forms in which the Lord's Prayer is found in St. Matthew and in St. Luke. It is of the greatest interest that we should, if possible, know the exact form in which it left our Lord's lips. Now we find in St. Luke's version two or three expressions which a wider examination of the gospel shows to be characteristic of his style, and we infer that 'at least some of the differences in wording between this form and that in Matthew are due to Luke, and that the form in Matthew better represents the original which would be in Aramaic.' It will readily be seen that this line of argument has an important bearing on the question of the origin of the Synoptic Gospels. Another illustration shall show how a close attention to the Greek bears definitely on the practical teaching of the Gospels. In St. Luke xiv. 12 the *pres. imp.* *μὴ φώνει* shows that the meaning is 'do not *habitually* call.' It is the *exclusive* invitation of rich neighbours that is forbidden. Again a point of doctrine may gain a great deal by close study of the Greek. In illustration of this we may refer to the significance of the *οὖν* in St. Luke xxii. 70. Our Lord has just referred to the passage in Daniel, *From henceforth shall the Son of*

¹ See the review of this book by Dr. Moulton in the *Critical Review*, April 1897, p. 213: 'One set of scholars bids us remember that constructions which could not be distinguished in Aramaic, must be indistinguishable in Greek which is based on Aramaic sources. . . . From the other side steps up the student of modern Greek prepared to forbid us from recognising life and vigour in constructions of New Testament Greek which are commonplace in the language of to-day. The 'aoristic' perfect, and the equivalence of *ἵνα* with subjunctive to a simple infinitive, may serve as specimens.

Man be seated at the right hand of the power of God. And those whom He is addressing say, *Art thou then the Son of God?* The *ὄν* shows us that from our Lord's reference to Himself as Son of Man they inferred a claim to be 'the Son of God,' whether they meant that in a vague Messianic sense, or used the term with some higher meaning. We get, in this way, from this passage, some additional light on the difficult expression *Son of Man*, and its significance for those to whom our Lord so often addressed the term.

Literary, practical, and doctrinal points are often elucidated, then, by that close study of the Greek which even at the present day requires to be justified in the eyes of some people.

But the building up of safe arguments requires an examination of all the evidence, and, may we add, the exercise of that common sense which is too often wanting in the literary criticism applied to the New Testament by the Procrustean methods of many expositors. To take the last point first. It is not safe to imply that a word or expression used in one or two places with a very definite and precise meaning is always so used. In this respect we think that some of Dr. Plummer's statements in the volume before us really want to be qualified. For example, it is no doubt true as a general rule that *κατέχειν* means to 'hold fast' (p. 222), and many instances might be quoted, but it is not invariably the case, for its use in xiv. 9—*then shalt thou begin with shame to take (κατέχειν) the lowest room*—is at any rate one negative instance. This we admit is not a very strong illustration. Another is the use of *σύν* and *μετά*. If we may argue that 'the use of *μετ'* ἐμοῦ implies not merely in my company *σύν* ἐμοί but sharing with Me' (p. 355), what are we to make of the passage in xxiv. 29, 30, where St. Luke seems to use them indifferently, *μείνον μεθ' ἡμῶν . . . καὶ εἰσῆλθεν τοῦ μείναι σύν αὐτοῖς*, and where Dr. Plummer's note is *μεθ' ἡμῶν* is simply 'in our company,' though a few pages earlier he had pressed it to mean more than this? Apropos of this small point, it is interesting to be reminded (p. 34) that St. Luke greatly prefers *σύν* to *μετά*, in spite of the fact that throughout the development of the Greek language the tendency is the other way. Another point bearing on our present argument is the distinction made (p. 305) between *κατοικεῖν* and *παροικεῖν*, the first being stated to mean taking up a *permanent* abode, and the latter a 'temporary sojourn.' The latter is probably true, but is it possible to maintain the former in face of two such passages as Acts ii. 5, 14, one of

wh
who
ever
sug
that
prea
hort
ἐτε
wha
the
be p
quot
him
ἱστα
the
But
St.
pass
migh
are
ἐπὶ
καὶ
wha
seed
the
diffe
mad
whe
mea
kina
36,
Test
sible
door
(the
cont
John
migh
in th
the C
For
poss
ἀγγο
cons
be p

which Dr. Plummer quotes, where the word is used of those who had come up *temporarily* to the feast of Pentecost 'from every nation under heaven'? Again, it is an interesting suggestion, and one which stimulates our interest, to be told that when St. Luke says of John the Baptist that he preached many other things (πολλὰ καὶ ἕτερα) in his exhortation to the people, he means to imply by the use of ἕτερα things of 'a different kind.' We begin to wonder what sort of teaching the word covers, different from what the Evangelist records; but unfortunately the word cannot be pressed to mean as much as this. In the solitary case quoted in support by Dr. Plummer—Gal. i. 6, 7—St. Paul himself *contrasts* it with ἄλλος (εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο), and we are justified in supposing that he used the words with the ordinary classical contrast of meaning. But it is *not* a fair inference from the words in the passage of St. Luke, or in vii. 20 (ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν;), or in a later passage (ix. 56), where Dr. Plummer says εἰς ἑτέραν κώμην might very well mean a village of another kind; *unless* we are to believe also that when our Lord said ἕτερον κατέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν . . . καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεσεν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀκανθῶν . . . καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν (viii. 5-8), He meant—what we are sure Dr. Plummer would not assert—that the seed in each case was different in kind; or *unless* (in xi. 26) the seven *other* spirits 'more wicked than himself' were different in kind. There can be little doubt that the point made by Dr. Plummer cannot be maintained. Other cases where we think Dr. Plummer will not be able to justify the meaning he wishes a word to bear are (p. 153) ποῖος, what *kind* of way, in face of its use in such passages as Matt. xxii. 36, xxiv. 42, 43, though we admit that generally in the New Testament it has the meaning he assigns; again, is it possible to maintain (xiii. 24) that θύρα necessarily means a door leading directly into the house as contrasted with πύλη (the outside gate), unless the two are in the *same* passage contrasted, when we remember that θύρα is used (in St. John x. 1) for the door leading into the sheepfold? We might multiply instances where we differ from Dr. Plummer in the arguments which may safely be drawn from the use of the Greek, and sometimes from his translation of the Greek. For example, is the first translation of St. Luke i. 35 even *possible*? 'the holy thing which shall be born' for τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται. It is only fair to say that Dr. Plummer considers 'that which shall be born shall be called holy' to be preferable. Again, in the difficult verse (vii. 47) οὐ χάριν,

λέγω σοι, ἀφέωνται αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῆς αἱ πολλαί, ὅτι ἡγάπησεν πολὺ, will the Greek allow the following translation? *For which reason I say to thee her many sins have been forgiven (and I say this to thee), because she loved much, i.e. λέγω σοι is not parenthetical, but is the main sentence.* Again (p. 11), is it possible to translate ἔλαχε τοῦ θυμῶσαι εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸν ναόν, *he obtained by lot to go in and burn incense?* The ordinary translation is not difficult if ναός be taken of the whole temple proper as contrasted with the Court of the Gentiles, though we see the Revised Version *seems* to favour the, to us, impossible translation. The importance to be attached to prepositions in composition in the New Testament is another fruitful field for argument; and here, too, there are places where we differ from Dr. Plummer, e.g. as to ἐπαισχύνομαι (ix. 26), ἀνατάξασθαι, ἐπιγιγνώσκω, and other words. Are we to infer (xxii. 14) that it is the preposition in ἀναπίπτω which makes it always 'imply a change of position'?

We have brought forward all these instances, where the argument turns on the exact use of the Greek, to illustrate the details into which the Commentary goes, and not to draw the inference that Dr. Plummer has failed in general either to examine all the evidence or to exercise that common sense to the frequent absence of which we referred above. Indeed there come out from time to time a robustness and freedom of language which give evidence of a very healthy way of disposing of fads. For example:

'It is monstrous to argue that because Luke has (possibly) made a mistake as to Quirinius being governor at this time, therefore the whole story about the census and Joseph's journey to Bethlehem is a fiction' (p. 50).

Or again, in reference to our Lord's temptation, he says:

'Many futile and irreverent questions have been raised respecting this mysterious subject; futile because it is impossible to answer them except by empty conjectures; and irreverent because they are prompted by curiosity rather than by a desire for illumination. Had the answers to them been necessary for our spiritual welfare, the answers would have been placed within our reach' (p. 105).

So again he disposes summarily, but not too summarily, of some who would say that a large part of the eschatological chapter is a prophecy after the event.

'It is said that these details show that the prophecy has been reworded to fit the event more precisely, and that therefore this Gospel was written after A.D. 70. The argument is precarious,

although the conclusion is probable. At any rate it is worthy of note that neither here nor elsewhere does Luke call attention to the fulfilment of the prophecy, as he does in the case of Agabus (Acts xi. 28). . . . It is not logical to maintain that Jesus could foresee the siege, but could not have foreseen these details; or to maintain that He would make known the coming siege, but would not make known the details' (p. 451).

One point in this same connexion illustrating what we may call the literary common sense of the writer, is that where an expression is used in one set of circumstances in one gospel, and in another set of circumstances by one of the other evangelists, Dr. Plummer, instead of saying that one is right to the exclusion of the other, takes up the position that some of our Lord's striking words were no doubt repeated on more than one occasion, as well they might have been. Under this category come such words as 'Can the blind lead the blind?' given in one context in St. Matthew, in another by St. Luke. Another instance is the teaching as to the light of the body, given in two rather different forms by St. Luke, and in quite a different connexion by St. Matthew. Many other illustrations might be given. It must be added, however, that Dr. Plummer refuses in several cases to resort to this explanation:

'The fact that many of Christ's sayings were uttered more than once, and were differently arranged on different occasions, will partly explain the resemblances and differences between Luke and Matthew here and elsewhere. But it is also probable that there has been some confusion in the traditions, and that words which one tradition placed in one connexion were by another tradition placed in another' (p. 317; cp. also p. 500).

A case in which Dr. Plummer refuses to accept the hypothesis of repetition is in regard to the lament over Jerusalem, which in St. Luke is placed in connexion with our Lord's stay in Peræa (xiii. 34), while St. Matthew gives it more naturally (xxiii. 37) during our Lord's last week at Jerusalem: 'to suppose that such words were spoken on two different occasions is rather a violent hypothesis' (p. 351). Somewhat similar to the cases we have just been considering are a fairly numerous class of well-known instances, in which an incident or parable recorded by one Evangelist is thought to be identical with a somewhat similar incident or parable recorded in another connexion by one of the other Evangelists. In some of these instances a final conclusion is not likely to be reached: thus of the parable of the great supper Dr. Plummer writes: 'The identity of this with the parable of

the marriage of the King's Son . . . will continue to be discussed, for the points of similarity and difference are both of them so numerous that a good case may be made for either view' (p. 359). Other cases to which we may refer are the supper and anointing recorded in St. Luke vii. 36 ff. (which by many is identified with that recorded by the other three Evangelists at our Lord's last visit to Jerusalem), the missions of the twelve and the seventy, the parables of the pounds and the talents, the healings of the man with the dropsy and the man with the withered hand, and many others which have been the occasion of much misplaced ingenuity, but which are dealt with very sensibly by Dr. Plummer. We would not, however, be thought to imply that there is nothing more than common sense in this Commentary. Dr. Plummer refers in his preface to having written and rewritten many of his notes, and this in itself implies a long study of the words of the Gospel, and of such study we have many proofs in suggestive remarks, and good points made. Some of these, selected at random, may interest our readers. 'Blessed is *she* that believed. . . . This is the first beatitude in the Gospel, and it is also the last (John xx. 29).' Again, a good point is made in regard to the difficulty about the enrolment, in answer to an objection, sometimes raised against the historical character of the whole statement, that 'Augustus would not interfere with Herod's subjects in the matter of taxation' because Herod was a so-called *rex socius*. Dr. Plummer points out that 'when Palestine was divided among Herod's three sons, Augustus ordered that the taxes of the Samaritans should be reduced by one-fourth because they had not taken part in the revolt against Varus; and this was before Palestine became a Roman province. If he could do that, he could require information as to taxation throughout Palestine, and the obsequious Herod would not attempt to resist' (p. 49). Again, in regard to the meaning of *ἀσβεστος* (pp. 95, 96) it is pointed out that 'as an epithet of *πῦρ*, it is opposed to *μαλθακόν* and *μακρόν*. . . . It is therefore a fierce fire which cannot be extinguished, rather than an endless fire that will never go out, that seems to be indicated.' Again, in the translating of xiii. 7, *ἵνα τί καὶ τὴν γῆν καταργεῖ*; a point lost in the A.V., and not made intelligible in the baldly literal translation of the R.V., is well brought out, 'Why in addition to doing no good does it sterilize the ground?' The fig tree not only gives no fruit itself, it also renders good soil useless.¹

¹ On the other hand he seems to translate with a false emphasis the *καὶ* in xvi. 1, which belongs to *πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς*, and not to *εἰλεγε*.

In regard to the date of the Last Supper, and the vexed question of its coincidence with the Jewish passover, Dr. Plummer points out (p. 541) that Joseph of Arimathea is spoken of (St. Mark xv. 46) as buying linen for our Lord's burial after His crucifixion, 'which is another sign that the feast had not begun the previous evening.' These are but instances of different ways in which Dr. Plummer has frequently something to say which is suggestive, and they might be multiplied indefinitely. We rather fancy that sometimes Dr. Plummer has acquiesced too easily in the idea that finality is not to be reached, and has cut the discussion unduly short. Two cases of this are his notes on the site of Golgotha (p. 530), and on the chronology of the last week of our Lord's life. There are many other passages in which we have been disappointed with the notes, especially where large and important questions are raised. Among others we may mention the following: vii. 35, 47; xi. 4; xii. 10, 48; xiii. 32, 33; xvi. 16; xxii. 19. The notes on demoniac possession (pp. 133, 136) also seem to us deficient. On the other hand the discussion of difficult words is often very good and complete. In regard to *ἐπιούσιος*, for instance, we are glad to have the suggestion made by A. N. Jannaris that it is in formation analogous to *περιούσιος*, coined by the Septuagint from *περιουσία*, and that its significance is, 'Ask not for bread *περιούσιον* to be treasured up as wealth, but for bread *ἐπιούσιον* mere bread.' By the way, is it reasonable to suppose that *ἐπιούσιος* can be a feature introduced into the prayer for liturgical purposes, as Dr. Chase (quoted on p. 294) supposes? Surely in this case some easier and more familiar word would have been selected. Another good verbal note is that on *λικμήσει*. In the great anxiety which Dr. Plummer shows to illustrate as fully as possible the meaning of a word, it would be strange if there were not here and there some things which the critic (and perhaps we may add Dr. Plummer himself), if he had been editor, would have excised. Thus, for example, on p. 207, the paragraph beginning 'with *καθημένοις*' might have disappeared without any real loss, for the passages quoted do not seem to elucidate the words in any way. Another note which seems superfluous is that on the words *ἐτίλλον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡσθιον τοὺς στάχνας* (p. 166), the whole of which is occupied with explaining a difficult passage in the parallel narrative of St. Mark. Again, on p. 140, nearly the whole of the long note seems to us irrelevant in its present position, though it would be very appropriate elsewhere. These remarks are intended

to show how more room might have been obtained for notes which may have been omitted for want of space. To secure the same object a large number of quotations from the renderings of the Latin versions might have disappeared. For the student of the history of the Latin versions such variations as *ex hoc, a modo, a nunc* (p. 32) as translations of ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν may be 'interesting,' but they are of no practical value for the interpretation of the Greek text, nor do they represent any variations in the Greek. This is, we hope, not an unfair illustration of a number of quotations which Dr. Plummer has given from the Oxford edition of the Vulgate.¹ Space might have been gained, to an appreciable extent, in another direction, if the notes on the use and meaning of a word had been collected and given where the word first occurs, instead of being distributed. Thus the fullest note on the Samaritans, and a reference to the literature, occurs at the last place in which they are mentioned (p. 405). As an illustration of the space lost by not collecting into one place all that has to be said about a word, we may refer to the notes on κατακλίνω at ix. 14, xiv. 8, xxiv. 30, in which there is a large amount of repetition. On the other hand there are a certain number of places where additional references and longer notes might be given. To some of these we have already alluded above. For example, the note on κερηματοισμένον (ii. 26) seems to contain no references to the (perhaps derived) use of the word (in the active) in the sense of 'to be called,' as, for example, at Acts xi. 26, χρηματίζειν τε πρώτως ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τοὺς μαθητὰς Χριστιάνους, or again at Rom. vii. 3 μοιχαλὶς χρηματίζει. In the note on περισπᾶτο (x. 40) the reference to 1 Cor. vii. 35 ἀπερὶσπαστῶς might have been added. To illustrate the distinction between φορτίον and βάρος (xi. 46) an excellent point might have been made by referring to the passage where they are contrasted in Gal. vi. 2, ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε . . . ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον φορτίον βαστάσει, where even R.V. (except in the margin) does not make the distinction, which is necessary to explain the collocation of the two injunctions. In illustrating the expression τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ (vi. 12), perhaps as good a parallel as any will be found in St. Mark xi. 22 (ἔχετε πίστιν Θεοῦ) or St. James ii. 1 (ἔχετε τὴν πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ). In discussing the parables in which our Lord deals with fasting, and the relation of the Old Dispensation to the

¹ We differ widely on principle from Dr. Plummer when he attempts in a commentary to make students independent of a concordance, or of such a book as the Vulgate.

New (v. 36-9), an allusion to Hort's excellent remarks in his *Judaistic Christianity* might have been inserted, and in a later edition it might be well to add a reference to the same writer's 'Sermons on the Temptation' in the volume of *Village Sermons*. In regard to the sacrificial meaning of ποιεῖν, though we agree with Dr. Plummer that it is rather pressing the word unduly to make it mean (xxii. 19) *This sacrifice in remembrance of Me*, yet it would have been well to add a reference to the place where this view seems to be maintained.¹ But after all a selection has to be made, both of references to books and illustrations from the New Testament. One more point we should like to refer to, and that is the list of uncial manuscripts (on p. lxxi), which seems intended to be complete, but is really not so. We will pass on now to a certain number of cases where Dr. Plummer does not seem to us to be clear as to his meaning, or where (perhaps owing to the compression he has imposed upon himself) his statements seem to want further support than they get, or where his statements and references are wrong.² We were startled at

¹ E. F. Willis, *Sacrificial Aspect, etc.*

² The use of the following list of comparatively unimportant corrections, which does not profess to be complete, will be facilitated if we follow the pages of the book instead of classifying the mistakes as we had intended to do : p. vii, σταυρωθέντα ; p. xix, n. after 23 add 24 ; p. xx, n. read Ramsay ; p. xxxiv n. Boanergés ; p. xli, palsied ; p. xlv, ὀφειλός, παγίς, παρτί : p. xlix, distinguishes : p. lvii, παγίς ; p. lxxviii, ἴδτε : p. 5, ὦν : p. 23, last line, it ? ; p. 24 n. ἀνὴρ ; p. 25, Ναζωραῖος : p. 38, l. 15 ἐν ; p. 38, εὐλογία ; p. 42, ἀμαρτιῶν ; p. 43, σπλάγχχνος ; p. 44, is the reference to Rom. iv. 20 really a parallel ? ; p. 57, ἐπέστη : p. 62, παιδίων, αὐτόν ; p. 109, this does not (?) agree well ; p. 126, ἱατρῆ ; p. 127, l. 2, X ; p. 145, Origen, ἦ ; p. 151, ἀσθενειῶν ; p. 157, εὐθύς ; p. 165, novana (?), δευτεροπρώτῳ : p. 170, phrensy (?) : p. 171, ἰς characteristic . . . and ἰς : on vii. 1, for nor read or ; p. 199, ἐσπλαγχνίσθη : p. 202, Chrysostom : p. 203, εὐαγγέλιον, μακάριοι : p. 208, σο φ ἰα, wrong fount ; p. 210, l. 28, ἦν ; p. 215, πνευμάτων ; p. 223, εἰσπορευόμενοι ; p. 233, Caesarea (?) ; p. 234, εἶναι, φθορά : p. 235, prolonging it, whereas ; p. 252, Mark tells : ix. 62, for nor read or ; p. 272, for g (?) read q ; p. 273, μηδὲν ; p. 275, ἀπομάσσειν ; p. 278, ῥήγματι, ἀπὸ τοῦ ; p. 280, ὀνόματα, ἐγγράπται ; p. 292 n. προσευχόμενοι : p. 295 n. ἄγων ; p. 299, καὶ γὰρ ; p. 300, πέρις ; p. 304, εἰς τὸν οἶκον : pp. 310, 468, *Sicle* ; p. 313, Church ; p. 318, πορνείας ; p. 319, passerine (?) birds ; p. 327, kinds, ἱνός (twice) ; p. 329, ποίμνιον (second time) ; p. 330, αὐτῷ ; *ib. n.* are *sordidi* and *stolidi* both right ? ; p. 333, πολλὰς ; p. 345, one and a half of, is this English ? ; p. 351, ἀπεσταλμένοις ; p. 361, ἀρχεσθαι, ἔλ wrong fount of type ; p. 362, last line, πλατεῖαι : p. 372, συναγαγόν ; p. 382, διαβηθείσης : p. 386 (second time), μαμωνᾶ ; p. 391, Λάζαρος ; p. 400 n. in LXX in : p. 409, ἐπὶ ; p. 411, εὐχῆς ; p. 414, α *fortiori* ; p. 419, ἰδασθῆναι ; p. 422, τί ἀγαθὸν ἀνωτάτῃ (?) ; p. 423, στερήσης : p. 425, word : p. 428, αὐτοῖς ; p. 440, ἐμοί ; p. 447, ἤρξαντο ; p. 457, ἀποκρίθητε : p. 460, ἴσως ; *ib.* how can *Latt* be quoted for *διελογίσαντο* as against *διελογίζοντο* ; p. 464, mentions ; p. 469, ὁ αἰὼν, καταβιβάζοντες (second time) ; p. 477, Tac. ; p. 478, ἐγερθήσεται : p. 480, ἀντιστήται ; p. 486, or earlier, Rendel ;

the suggestion (on p. 53) that St. Luke might have written *μονογενὴν* instead of *πρωτότοκον*. We wonder what St. Luke himself would have thought of such an accusative of *μονογενής*. We are aware that there is manuscript authority for it, as, for example, for *ποδῆρην* in Rev. i. 13 (A), and parallels might be quoted from the LXX; but we fancy Dr. Plummer must confess to a bad *lapsus calami* here. We were somewhat amused, too (pp. 132-3), that after criticizing Wordsworth for inaccuracy, and Alford for inaccuracy in correcting Wordsworth, and Edersheim as still more inaccurate, and Farrar for 'strange misstatements,' Dr. Plummer himself should be found in error when he says 'the facts are these.' The question is as to the uses of *δαιμόνιον* and *πνεῦμα* with *ἀκάθαρτον* and *πονηρόν* by the Evangelists. Adopting the same method of calculation as Dr. Plummer, and following Westcott and Hort's text, we fancy that instead of the facts being that 'Luke has *δαιμόνιον* twenty-two times, with *ἀκάθαρτον* as an epithet once of *δαιμόνιον*, and once of *πνεῦμα*; and with *πονηρόν* twice as an epithet of *πνεῦμα*,' the figures should run twenty-three times . . . *five times* of *πνεῦμα* . . . *three times* (if we include xi. 26) as an epithet of *πνεῦμα*. With some trembling, lest we should ourselves be wrong, we suggest that *these* are the facts.¹ Other statements which we believe to be inaccurate are these: p. 141, St. Matthew uses *βασι*. τοῦ θεοῦ four times (the reference to xix. 24 being omitted); p. 244, *κλισίαι* *does* occur in Biblical Greek, viz. 3 Macc. vi. 31; p. 346, *if* Dr. Plummer means that *ισχύω* does not occur in the LXX, this is very far indeed from being true, as a reference to the Concordance will show; p. 524, surely *ἀνακρίνω* may be said to be used in a forensic sense in several passages in 1 Cor., and if so the word is not 'peculiar to Luke in N.T.,' p. 554, if Dr. Plummer means that *βραδύς* occurs only in Luke xxiv. 25 in Biblical Greek, he forgets the two passages in St. James i. 19; p. 275, *κολλάομαι* occurs *five* times elsewhere

p. 488, *Ἑλαίων*; p. 495, *διαμερίσαστε*; p. 503, *ἐξητήσατο*; p. 504, *σινιάσαι*, *σινίον*, *ἡμᾶς*; p. 511, *ἰδρῶς*; p. 512, *ἐταίρε*; 513, *or* without violence, *or* in; p. 516, *or* any of the Sanhedrin, *or*, *λαλιά*; p. 522, *Asmonæans*; p. 524, *ἀνέπεμψα*; p. 527, *ἀγροῦ*, wrong fount of type: p. 528, *ἔπισθεν*; p. 540, *κεκρυμμένοι*; p. 541, *προσεδέχετο*; p. 547 (last line), *ἐν τῷ* . . . *καὶ ἰδοὺ*; p. 550, *τὰ ῥήματα*; p. 553, *παροιμία*; p. 555, *ἀρξάμενος*; p. 556, *εἰς ἣν*; p. 558, *ἐνδεκα*; p. 560, *ἔχετε*; p. 563, *ἰδοὺ ἐγώ*; p. 565, *προσκυνήσαντες*; p. 567, common *text*.

¹ Perhaps Dr. Plummer has used a different Concordance, not based on Westcott and Hort's text, which, however, he professes to follow. This might account for the following wrong references: p. 37, John xiii. 24; p. 411, Gal. vi. 9, Eph. iii. 13, 2 Thess. iii. 13, W and H. do not read *ἐγκατείν*; p. 494, om. ref. to Matt. xv. 4; p. 523, Acts i. 10 reads *ἐσθθης*; p. 548, om. Acts xxii. 9; p. 563, om. ref. to Luke vii. 27.

(1 Cor. said to he ha verify can en have, follow on viii James read x referen Mark Rende Dr. Pl vincin intanc that ' day to there less nu rather mise t record from t we ma becom to divi where should be quc an ins saying sative the ca Ca may h καταλ down, in the seem regard John a and a places becom equal

(1 Cor. vi. 17 being omitted), and only *two* can, we think, be said to be quotations from the LXX. Dr. Plummer tells us he has carefully verified his references, and after ourselves verifying, in one way or another, some hundreds of them we can endorse his claim. A certain number of wrong references have, however, escaped detection. Thus, on p. 201, we cannot follow the reference to Acts xxvi. 23, nor can we correct it; on viii. 29, read Acts xix. 29; on x. 38, read Acts xvii. 7, James ii. 25; on xiv. 9, read Prov. xxv. 6 (?); on p. 381, read xviii. 2; on p. 470, ? ref. to xxiii. 8; p. 17, the probable reference intended for *εὐαγγελίζομαι* is iii. 18; p. 264, read Mark iii. 17; p. 559, read John i. 18; p. 26, the reference to Rendel Harris is indefinite. Sometimes, as we have said, Dr. Plummer does not seem to us clear in statement or convincing, or draws conclusions which we cannot follow. For instance, is there anything to warrant the statement (p. 75) that 'the Nazareth caravan was so long that it took a whole day to look through it'?; again (on p. 244), what ground is there for saying that the women and children would be 'much less numerous than the men'? and is it fair, and is it not rather dangerous, to ask (p. 247) whether the praise and promise to St. Peter can be of 'supreme importance,' because recorded only in *one* Gospel? We do not see why (p. 424) from the words *ἡγάπησεν, πάντα πώλησεν, and ἀκολούθει μοι*, we may conjecture that our Lord's invitation was a 'call to become an Apostle.' We do not understand why the reference to divisions (p. 335) is the 'only' passage in the New Testament where Christ prepares His disciples for disappointment. We should have thought that, among other passages, xiii. 24 might be quoted. Is it correct to quote the case of Luke xxiii. 17 as an instance of *homoioteleuton*? What ground is there for saying (xii. 53) that the change from the dative to the accusative 'possibly indicates that the hostility is more intense in the case of the women'?

Cases where the statement seems misleading or not clear may be illustrated by the following examples. The note on *καταλῦσαι* (xix. 7) seems to imply that the sense 'to throw down, destroy,' is not classical, whereas it is very common: in the note on vii. 31-2 (p. 206), the whole note does not seem clear, and we are not at all sure which Dr. Plummer regards as the 'true interpretation.' The statements about John and James (pp. 173, 237, 250) are varied in expression, and a little difficult to reconcile; for if St. Luke (in xi. 28) places St. John's name first because 'he wrote after John had become the better known,' does not this explanation apply equally well to vi. 14? In the note on *ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν* (p. 126),

the passage in St. John ii. 23 can hardly bear on the ὅσα ἡκούσαμεν γένομενα εἰς τὴν Καφαρναούμ, because it seems to refer to miracles performed at Jerusalem. On p. 123, the statement that 'the *chazzan* of the synagogue became the deacon or the subdeacon of the Christian Church' seems to us to want either qualification or explanation. It will probably be wearisome to our readers to proceed further with these points of somewhat minute criticism, which it has been impossible to avoid because on them depends the value of the method pursued in the finer literary exegesis of the Greek Testament. We should be sorry to leave this part of the discussion without expressing the great interest we have had in reading the Commentary through. If we have seemed so far to dwell unduly on the points of difference rather than of agreement, it is because advance is more likely to be made in this way than by ignoring the points on which we differ from Dr. Plummer.

We propose, even at the risk of going over ground familiar to some of our readers, to turn for a little while to some of the main questions connected with St. Luke's Gospel, and to the views expressed by Dr. Plummer about them. In regard to St. Luke himself the few references in Scripture, and all that is known about him from later writers and tradition, are well put together. If, as is probable from the context of Col. iv. 14, he is to be distinguished from 'they of the circumcision' mentioned earlier, this will be fatal to his having been one of the Seventy, a tradition which has been accepted in the selection of that passage about the Seventy as the Gospel for St. Luke's Day. His own statement in the preface, so similar to that of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 3, 4), implies that he was not an eye-witness of the facts of our Lord's life, and if so, this would be fatal to his identification with the unnamed disciple to whom our Lord appeared at Emmaus. There is good ground for connecting him with Antioch in Syria, not Antioch in Pisidia, as Mr. Rendall, on the strength of what seems to us a misinterpretation of Acts xiv. 22, asserts in his recently published Commentary on the Acts. To the passages from the Acts quoted by Dr. Plummer might have been added the reading of D at xi. 27-28, the first use of ἡμεῖς. That he was a physician—*medicus Antiochensis*, as Jerome says—is quite in keeping with the narrative in the Acts, for the 'beloved physician' may have been in attendance on St. Paul, and it is also in agreement with the very marked use of medical terms by St. Luke both in the Gospel and in the Acts.¹ The tradi-

¹ On this question Dr. Plummer makes some very discriminating

tion th
sixth c
ing a p
It is a
St. Lu
pared
Many
buted
and th
degree
also in
Very v
(l-lxxi
on St.
ments

The
the in
soluble
It is,
scarcity
reports
and th
in narr
ings' (t
tion of
relation
opinion
before
by St.
Gentile
with S
Matthe
readers
which
been le
St. Lu
Lord, a
and va

remarks
is 'due
training.

¹ It s
his style
prie to
suppose,
conscious
acquaint

tion that he was also a painter goes back probably to the sixth century, and the legend which represents him as painting a portrait of the Virgin has 'a strong element of truth.' It is a commonplace of New Testament study to refer to St. Luke's classical style and knowledge of Greek, as compared with the language used by St. Matthew and St. Mark. Many of his variations of expression may be rightly attributed to this. At the same time his Gospel is strongly marked, and that irregularly, by the use of Hebraisms, due in some degree to the sources which he used for his history, and also in large measure to his acquaintance with the LXX.¹ Very valuable, and proof of enormous labour, are the pages (l-lxxii) in which Dr. Plummer has collected the facts bearing on St. Luke's style, and, as we have already said, the arguments which may be based on them affect important points.

They contain, for instance, much that bears directly on the interesting, but (we would almost venture to say) insoluble problem of the relation of the synoptic narratives. It is, for instance, an important point that 'absence or scarcity of St. Luke's characteristics is most common in those reports of discourses which are common to him and Matthew,' and that 'there is much more variation between the Gospels in narrating the same facts than in reporting the same sayings' (p. xxvi), because these point to the faithful preservation of the actual words of our Lord. In regard to St. Luke's relation to St. Matthew and St. Mark, Dr. Plummer is of opinion (1) that St. Luke may have had the Second Gospel before him, though the *omission* of certain incidents recorded by St. Mark which would have been of especial interest to Gentile readers is against this; (2) that he was not familiar with St. Matthew, for he omits again many things which St. Matthew records, and which would have interested Gentile readers, and, moreover, there are many well-known differences which have puzzled the harmonist, and would hardly have been left unnoticed by St. Luke; (3) that St. Matthew and St. Luke both used one *or more* collections of sayings of our Lord, and that in this way the frequent agreement in matter, and variation in the arrangement of the matter, are both

remarks (pp. lxiii-lxvi) showing that in many cases the use of the words is 'due to his knowledge of the LXX rather than to his professional training.'

¹ It seems a little fanciful to suppose that in places St. Luke 'allowed his style to be Hebraistic, because he felt that such a style was appropriate to the subject matter' (p. xlix). Nor does it seem so easy to suppose, as a recent writer suggests, that in chapters i. and ii. St. Luke is consciously imitating the style of the Septuagint, as that his thorough acquaintance with it makes him use it unconsciously.

explained; (4) that St. Luke also had special and peculiar sources which are especially prominent in chapters i. and ii., in the large section ix. 51-xix. 28, and in the conclusion of the Gospel. We pass over the question of *date*, merely noticing that Dr. Plummer is inclined to adopt some date intermediate between the earliest and latest that have been suggested, as combining the advantages of both, and avoiding the difficulties of both, and to accept some date between A.D. 75 and A.D. 80. The *object and plan* are next discussed, and in this connexion the unique preface is considered. A good deal turns here on the precise meaning of the special terms used, and in regard to some we differ a little from Dr. Plummer. Thus, in face of the many places in which St. Luke mentions teaching and miracles that he might have recorded but passes over with a reference only, we cannot believe that he desired 'to make his Gospel as *complete* as possible,' for the 'all things' which he traced accurately from the beginning must not be unduly pressed in view of St. Luke's fondness for the word *πᾶς*. Nor, again, is it easy to understand *καθεξῆς*, except roughly, in the sense of chronological order. There is a general agreement between St. Mark and St. Luke over the first part, which is roughly coincident with the Galilean ministry; in the second part, which is mainly peculiar to St. Luke and deals with the journeys between Galilee and Jerusalem, St. Matthew and St. Mark are mostly in agreement, while in the narrative of the last week of our Lord's life they all three deal with common material. But, though those rough divisions may be accepted, resembling, in a certain degree, that which exists in the Acts in the Judæan ministry, the transitional period, and the preaching to the Gentiles outside Palestine, there are so many cases where the reference to chronology is obviously very vague and where the juxtaposition of incidents is to be put down to a chance word or idea, that it is impossible to accept the general principle of chronological arrangement as intended by St. Luke. For example, *ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν* is used to introduce the narrative of some act or teaching of our Lord, or an incident such as the mission of the twelve is recorded with no note of time or connexion, or a long discourse is broken by the insertion of something like *εἶπεν δέ*, an expression characteristic of St. Luke, which 'seems to indicate that there is an interval between what precedes and what follows' (p. 127).¹ St. Luke is sometimes vague in his connexion and

¹ It is not always possible to maintain this: for example, at vi. 39 there is a 'connexion with what precedes,' and yet the words are used,

chron
and S
be the
Caper
true o
contra
definit
passag
μετὰ μ
denial
with t
Gospel
positio
particu
preced
widow
of the
whole,
logical
interp
ment t
a refer
which
nexior
been n
St. Joh
tians v
St. Lu
went t
that J
ἐκεῖ.
third
charac
narrati
second
more t
dictory
relatio
need o
illustra
eviden
Gospel
ings, a
and the
pp. 161,
VOL.

chronology where the others are definite. Thus St. Matthew and St. Mark connect one of the disputes 'as to who should be the greatest' with the return from Cæsarea Philippi to Capernaum, St. Luke says nothing as to time; the same is true of the incidents recorded at xxi. 5, xxii. 1. On the contrary, St. Luke is sometimes definite where they are indefinite, as, for example, at xiii. 18 or xxii. 59. In this last passage, where St. Matthew and St. Mark use the expression *μετὰ μικρόν* in connexion with the interval between St. Peter's denials, St. Luke says *διαστάσης ὥσεί ὥρας μῆας*. In connexion with this same question of the arrangement of St. Luke's Gospel, we may suggest that it is quite likely that the juxtaposition of a number of facts and sayings of our Lord at a particular place may be due to some point in the immediately preceding narrative; thus the saying (xx. 47) about robbing widows' houses might naturally lead on to the recollection of the incident of the 'widow's mites' (xxi. 1-4). On the whole, therefore, we are not much inclined to hold the chronological arrangement of St. Luke's Gospel, and should not interpret *καθεξῆς* in that sense. We pass from the arrangement of St. Luke's Gospel and its relation to the others, with a reference only to two other points. The first is the way in which Dr. Plummer very frequently throws light on the connexion between the third and fourth gospels, a fact which has been noticed by others before. Thus (p. 479) St. Luke and St. John particularly emphasize that the persecution of Christians will come from the Jews; again (p. 508), St. Luke, and St. Luke alone, says that our Lord *κατὰ τὸ ἔθος* (xxii. 39) went to the Mount of Olives, while St. John tells us (xviii. 2) that Judas knew the place because *πολλάκις συνήχθη Ἰησοῦς ἐκεῖ*. Another point of undesigned coincidence between the third and fourth Gospels is the close agreement in the character of Martha and Mary as we gather them from the narratives of St. Luke x. 38-42 and St. John xi. The second point to which we wish to refer is to emphasize once more the great difficulty of dealing with the often contradictory phenomena in trying to work out the problem of the relation of the Synoptic narratives to each other, and the need of not hastily arriving at 'characteristics.' One or two illustrations will suffice. It is often urged that we have evidence of the presence of an eye-witness in St. Mark's Gospel, in the frequent allusions to our Lord's looks or feelings, as for example (iii. 5): *περιβλεψάμενος μετ' ὀργῆς*, and the phrase of δ' εἶπεν, which is very similar, has no such force; see pp. 161, 214, 360.

συλλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ πωρώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, or (x. 21) ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ἡγάπησεν αὐτόν. But if we pressed the argument to the same extent in St. Luke, we might arrive at the same conclusion, for it is noticed as one of the characteristics of St. Luke that he records the impression made by our Lord's acts and teaching on those who were present, often where the other Evangelists say nothing as to this. Moreover, we have at least two instances where St. Luke records a look or motion of our Lord, where the others omit it (see xx. 17, xxii. 61). This illustrates the extreme caution to be used before inferences can be safely drawn from *data* of this kind. We are inclined to think that very often these details are the insertion of the historian, rather than the necessary mark of the eye-witness.

We have left ourselves little space to deal with the general subject matter of the Gospel, as distinct from its arrangement and literary form; such, for example, as the stress laid on the universal character of the Gospel message, or on its connexion with St. Paul both in phraseology and in the prominent marks of his teaching, such as *χάρις* and *σωτηρία*. We cannot dwell on the points, in our Lord's doctrine, which St. Luke brings out in regard to prayer, and the responsibility of wealth,¹ or on the prominent references which he makes here, as in the Acts, to the Holy Spirit. From many of Dr. Plummer's notes the reader will get much that is interesting and suggestive on points like our Lord's method of teaching, His mode of answering questions, His choice and training of the Twelve. We cannot in the least accept his statements as to the limitation of Christ's human knowledge, such as those which he makes for instance (p. 473) in regard to our Lord's use of Ps. cx. We maintain, on the contrary, 'that Jesus *has* decided the question,' and that to doubt or dispute the Davidic authorship of that Psalm is to challenge the authority of our Blessed Lord Himself. On this point we greatly prefer the noble language of Dr. Liddon in the preface to the second edition of his sermon on the *Worth of the Old Testament*, p. 8. Nor, again, do we think that he is correct in his statements about the Roman coinage in Palestine (pp. 465-6), for it has been pointed out to the writer of this article, by a well-known and very accurate scholar, that Dr. Plummer 'has overlooked the distinction between the copper coinage of the Procurators which bore no *effigies*, and the silver imperial coinage not minted in Palestine to which the *denarius* belonged.'² The point is impor-

¹ His remarks on the supposed Ebionitism of St. Luke seem to us very good (see pp. 91, 300, 329).

² See Madden, *Jewish Coinage*, pp. 134 ff., 247 f.; and Schürer, *History &c.* E.T. i. ii. 77 f.

tant
tribu
in an
articl
ing o
Dr. P
on sr
hold
point
goes)
ment
of int
we ha
the d
autho
Herz
which
the b
beaut
when

A

1. *Th*
2. *Th*
3. *Co*
4. *On*
5. *Vi*

IT is
has b

tant because our Lord's argument turns on the fact that the tribute money bore the effigies *as a matter of course* and not in an accidental instance. We might have prolonged this article, but instead of doing so we will rest content with sending our readers to the volume itself. Our differences from Dr. Plummer, which we have not exhausted, are in the main on small points of criticism, on which it is often possible to hold opposite opinions. On the larger and more important points we may commend the volume as being (so far as it goes) a good specimen of sound scholarship, and a fair statement of the views that have been held on the many points of interest connected with the Gospel. The disappointment we have felt from time to time has been due to the fact that the discussions often seem to fail in real grip, while the authorities used are in the main few and obvious, such as Herzog, Edersheim, and one or two more, the references to which recur. But, even so, we may say that it seems to us the best English Commentary as yet available on a book the beauty of which Renan did not perhaps greatly exaggerate when he described it as *le plus beau livre qu'il y ait*.

ART. IX.—THE INTERNAL ORDER OF AN ENGLISH MONASTERY.

1. *The Observances in use at the Augustinian Priory of St. Giles and St. Andrew at Barnwell, Cambridgeshire.* Edited with a Translation and Glossary by JOHN WILLIS CLARK, M.A., F.S.A., Registrar of the University of Cambridge. (London, 1897.)
2. *The English Black Monks of St. Benedict.* A Sketch of their History. By the Rev. ETHELRED L. TAUNTON. (London, 1897.)
3. *Compotus Rolls of the Obedientiaries of St. Swithun's Priory, Winchester.* Edited by G. W. KITCHIN, D.D., F.S.A. (Hampshire Record Society.)
4. *On the Abbey of St. Edmund at Bury.* I. The Library. II. The Church. By MONTAGUE RHODES JAMES, Litt.D. (Cambridge Antiquarian Society.)
5. *Visitations of the Diocese of Norwich, A.D. 1492-1532.* Edited by the Rev. A. JESSOPP, D.D. (Camden Society.)

IT is somewhat remarkable, considering how much attention has been given during recent years to English Church

history, and especially how much has been written upon it from its antiquarian side, that the general reader is still almost left in the dark with regard to the internal life of the English monasteries; whilst matters are further obscured by the fact that prejudice has frequently been allowed to take the place of study in its elucidation. That this should be the case is the more remarkable in view of the fact that Dugdale and Stevens, Browne Willis and Bishop Tanner have done so much for the elucidation of their external history; and that in the great edition of Dugdale's *Monasticon Anglicanum*, published early in the present century in eight folio volumes, under the supervision of Sir Henry Ellis and others, we have a great storehouse of information, the like of which is possessed, with regard to its monasteries, by no other nation in Christendom.

This, however, deals for the most part with the external features and history of the monasteries. With regard to their internal life our information is considerably less satisfactory. English monasticism has been described as a whole, indeed, by Mr. O. Travers Hill, and more recently (and far more accurately) by Mr. Fox; but both of these descriptions are somewhat slight. Its early history receives some illustration in Mr. I. Gregory Smith's *Rise of Monasticism*, in which is gathered together the substance of his valuable articles in the Dictionaries of Christian Biography and Christian Antiquities. Its downfall is described with much graphic power and critical acumen in the volumes in which Dom F. A. Gasquet (following in the steps of a greater historian than he, Mr. R. W. Dixon, in his *History of the English Church from the Abolition of Roman Jurisdiction*) narrates the suppression of the monasteries at the hands of King Henry VIII. Again, readers of Dr. S. R. Maitland and Dean Church, not to speak of other writers, will at once call to mind graphic passages which have helped to make the life of a mediæval monastery a real thing to them. Whilst Mr. Ethelred Taunton's recently published *English Black Monks of St. Benedict*, although it is primarily a sketch of the English Benedictines, and as such is entitled to a fuller treatment elsewhere, contains also a somewhat slight description of the life of the members of the order.

But in spite of all these, it remains the fact that for the general reader the fullest account that we have of the inner life of an English monastery, and on the whole the best, is still that which is given in the pages of Fosbroke's *British Monachism*, a book which, even in its latest form, dates from

the e
better
Fosbr
Scott
not u
most
perfor
amon
mater
in it,
Mr. F
that v
comm
the va
peculi
is con
throw
system
house
M
on gr
inacce
tory r
the be
publis
the gr
of the
annals
repres
are p
incide
the m
been
laries,
posse
ments
(3) W
life of
and th
by the
respec
Dioces

¹ T
second
publish

the earlier half of the present century.¹ We shall realize better what ancient history it is when we remember that Mr. Fosbroke's work was old enough to be studied by Sir Walter Scott, who bestowed upon it his warm commendations. And not undeservedly ; for, in spite of the fact that it is marred by most of the prejudices of its day, it is a very meritorious performance, and contains a remarkable amount of research amongst what was then, to a large extent, unpublished material. But even if there were no other faults to be found in it, the whole treatment would be vitiated by the fact that Mr. Fosbroke made no attempt to discriminate, but assumed that whatever he found to be in use in one monastery was common to all others. He distinguished, of course, between the various Orders ; and in a few cases he noted what was peculiar to some particular house. But beyond this, his picture is composed of elements derived from heterogeneous sources, thrown together into one frame. The result of course is a system and a life something like that of many different houses, but exactly like that of none.

Meanwhile the material available for the purpose has gone on growing, by the publication of much that was previously inaccessible ; and it may be said in passing that the introductory matter contributed by the editors of this is amongst the best work that we have on the subject. (1) There has been published, by private enterprise, by means of societies, and in the great series produced under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, a large and ever-increasing collection of monastic annals and chronicles, in which most of the greater houses are represented for a shorter or longer period. These, it is true, are primarily concerned with external events ; but they incidentally throw not a little light upon the internal life of the monasteries from which they emanated. (2) There have been published a considerable number of monastic chartularies, containing the writings by which the houses held their possessions and privileges, together with many other documents throwing light on their constitution and character. (3) We have, further, such valuable records of the internal life of the society as are contained in the *Rites of Durham* and the *Compotus Rolls of St. Swithun's, Winchester*, published by the Surtees Society and the Hampshire Record Society respectively. (4) And in the *Episcopal Visitations of the Diocese of Norwich*, edited by Dr. Jessopp for the Camden

¹ The first edition (in two thin octavo volumes) appeared in 1802, the second (in quarto) in 1817, and the third (in one large octavo volume, published after the author's death) in 1843.

Society, we have an opportunity of seeing how far the rules of the various societies were actually observed in practice, and thus of testing and repudiating the monstrous allegations made in the *Comperta* of Cromwell's visitors. (5) But more valuable than anything else, we have the various *Consuetudines* of the various religious houses themselves. When Fosbroke wrote, the *Customs* had been published of few religious houses, excepting Cluny and two or three others on the Continent.¹ At the present day we have, not to speak of foreign houses, the *Consuetudinarium* of Abingdon and that of Bury, both published in the Rolls Series; that of St. Swithun's, Winchester, edited for the Hampshire Record Society by Dr. Kitchin, now Dean of Durham; that of St. Augustine's, Canterbury,² and doubtless others which have not been studied by the present writer.

To these must now be added the beautifully printed volume containing the *Observances* of the Augustinian Priory of Barnwell, which is placed first in the list of books at the head of this article. It is accompanied by an admirable Introduction and a translation from the competent hand of Mr. J. W. Clark; and we do not hesitate to say that, both on this account and owing to its intrinsic character, it throws more light upon the internal life of an English monastery than anything had done before.

Owing to its intrinsic character: for the Observances of an Augustinian house occupy a somewhat different position from those of a Benedictine house. For, in the words of Mr. Taunton,

'St. Benedict did not legislate for a world-wide corporation, but for a state of life. . . . The very fact that St. Benedict did not found an Order, but only gave a Rule, cuts away all possibility of that narrowing *esprit de corps* which comes so easily to a widespread and highly organized body. . . . This then being the idea, any form of government which destroys the autonomy of each house, or which tends to break up the family, is foreign to the very first principles of benedictine life, and can only be tolerated for a time under the plea of some very great necessity. Confederation of houses for mutual support and advice, on the other hand, is in keeping with the family idea; and for the general good each family may give up some of its

¹ The *Consuetudinary* of Cluny is in the first volume of D'Achery's *Spicilegium*; those of two Augustinian houses, St. Denis at Reims and St. Victor at Paris, are given in the third volume of Martene's *De Antiquis Ritibus*.

² This latter in substance only; it is given in the Appendix to vol. i. of Mr. Taunton's *English Black Monks of St. Benedict*. The text is to be printed in the forthcoming edition of Abbat Ware's *Consuetudinary*, to be published by the Henry Bradshaw Society (Taunton, i. 259 n).

rights
essen

I
dicti
had
deta
is tr
const
howe
parti
we c
anoth
Augu
the c
anoth
that
follow
altog
lares,
gradu
with

S
and i
claim

'T
above
Hippo
the R
accor
and a
one w

1 J
2 J
upon t
of frie
3 T
cess a
The fa
clunia
live, w
is true

4 T
differ
profess

5 C
that t
(Taun
apart,

rights, as is done in the State. But it must be so arranged that the essential rights are preserved intact.'¹

In accordance with this ideal, the *Customs* of a Benedictine house were purely internal to itself; and each house had its own customs, which might vary greatly in matters of detail from those of any other Benedictine house; though it is true also that in some cases two houses might have a consuetudinary almost identically the same.² In any case, however, it was simply a statement of what was done in the particular house, not something imposed from outside; and we cannot argue from the customs of one house to those of another. Elsewhere, however—with a Cluniac priory³ or an Augustinian house, for example—it was different. Here the customs of one house were, *mutatis mutandis*, those of another; the *consuetudines* are drawn up on the assumption that they are common to all the houses of the Order.⁴ It follows, of course, that they are regarded as having an altogether different character. They are *Observantiæ Regulares*, or *Observances in accordance with the Rule*, which gradually 'have come to be regarded as of nearly equal value with the Rule itself.'⁵

Such is the case with the Observances of Barnwell Priory; and it is this which gives them their peculiar value. They claim a very far-reaching authority:

'The road of Canons Regular [to the holy city of Jerusalem above the heavens] is the Rule of blessed Augustine, Bishop of Hippo. . . . Further, lest Canons Regular should wander away from the Rule, there are given to them in addition Observances in accordance with it, handed down from remote ages by ancient fathers, and approved among holy fathers in all quarters of the world. Some one will say, "Is not the Rule of blessed Augustine sufficient, seeing

¹ *English Black Monks*, i. 31-4.

² That of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, for example, was based directly upon that of Westminster. But this was simply the result of the relations of friendship between the two abbeys at the time that it was drawn up.

³ The Cluniac reformation of the Benedictine Order attained its success at the cost, in Mr. Taunton's words, of 'the loss of a vital principle. The family tie, so essential a feature in Benedictine life, was lost; for the cluniacs, in whichever of their hundred of houses they might happen to live, were counted members of this great abbey' (i. 20). The same thing is true of the Cistercians.

⁴ Though of course, as a matter of fact, there were considerable differences of detail in these *Observances*. Each set of Observances professes to be only a statement of the Customs of the Canons Regular.

⁵ *Observances*, p. xxxi. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that the Benedictine houses drew closer together as time went on (Taunton, ch. iii.), whilst the houses of Canons Regular gradually drifted apart, and so in course of time tended to become more or less disorderly.

that it is plain, and set forth by a man of the greatest learning? For what purpose, then, are Observances in accordance with the Rule (*observantie regulares*) added to it?" You must know, however, that . . . after the publication of the Rule of blessed Augustine to his Canons Regular traditions of ancient fathers were necessary, in order that those who have one dress, one Rule, and one profession, might have one conformity in their regular observances, and a safe watch-tower in their battle against vice. It is plain, therefore, that traditions of elders are necessary, I do not mean of those who at the present day preside over a General Chapter, for their statutes are easily published, and as easily repealed; but traditions of elders of ancient date which on this side of the sea, as well as on the other, show due reverence to God by means of Canons Regular (*per canonicos regulares dignum deo prestant obsequium*). Of these traditions, or, in other words, Observances in accordance with the Rule, those which seem to be of more binding obligation (*que magis necessarie videntur*) are set forth in chapters in this treatise' (pp. 34 f).

And they are drawn up with more of a view to edification, and with far greater minuteness, than would be the case with those of most Benedictine houses. Consequently, we are brought face to face with the features of the life of the English Austin Canons in a far closer way than was before possible. And while it is impossible in every case to argue directly from them to the members of another Order, the cases are not a few in which these Barnwell *Observances* undoubtedly throw light upon the whole of pre-Reformation monastic life.

We propose then, under the guidance of these *observantie regulares*, as edited by Mr. J. W. Clark, to set forth some of the main features of the monastic life as they concerned an Austin Canon at Barnwell, bringing such illustrations from the customs of other Orders as seem desirable, and especially from such as are contained in the books at the head of this article. It must of course be borne in mind that our *observantie* represent the *ideal* which the Canon Regular set before himself rather than what he actually attained to; but we are beginning to learn not only that it is more profitable to study men's ideals than their degradation, but that we can never truly understand what they actually were unless we know what they 'aspired to be.' We must remember, too, that the *Observances* were drawn up—or, at least, that the manuscript in which they are preserved was written—in 1295 or 1296; when the priory, originally founded in 1092 close to the Castle at Cambridge,¹ and removed to its later site in 1112,

¹ The founders, Picot, the Norman sheriff of Cambridgeshire, and Hugoline, his wife, 'ecclesiam in honore beati Egidii et officinas satis

had
Obs
spiri
to t
case
repr
as w

I
the
that
seve
of S
extr
that
and
amo
St. A
the
bret
mort
duti
mon
and
Ever
fama
worl

comp
this
aisle

1
differ

2
the A
and
solic
ing o
be pa
Abba
tion
there
(c. 64
over

3
absti
some
he be
their
those
to w

had been in existence just over two centuries. But the Observances themselves still remained, however much the spirit animating those who observed them, and their relation to the external world, may have been modified in certain cases. And we may fairly take the *observantie regulares* as representing the way of life throughout, excepting in so far as we may find evidence of actual change.

No mistake could be greater than that of thinking that the aim of a monastic life was one of solitude or isolation, or that it was based primarily upon an ideal of excessive severity.¹ So far from aiming at extreme severity, the Rule of St. Benedict was framed in order to guard against the extravagances of private asceticism; and its careful provisions that the work should not suffer by undue fasting or the like, and its tenderness to the weak, the infirm, and the aged, are among its most striking features.² The so-called Rule of St. Augustine does not differ from it in this respect;³ and the *Observances* abound in careful thoughtfulness for the brethren, and show clearly enough that the aim was not mortification, but the adequate performance of their common duties. So far from being isolated or solitary, the life of a monastery was essentially a common life, the most united and social form of life that was known in the middle ages. Every monastery was primarily not a corporation but a *family*; it was a corporation, indeed, in its relations with the world outside, but viewed from within it was a family first of

competentes Cantebricie iuxta castrum construxerunt' (p. xii). None of this church now remains, unless it be an arch at the east end of the south aisle in the present St. Giles' Church.

¹ Of course with some of the later Orders the case is altogether different.

² See the *Rule* in Migne, *P.L.* vol. lxxvi. col. 215 ff. For example, in the *Prologue* the Saint declares his intention of ordaining 'nothing harsh and nothing burdensome.' The Cellarer (c. 31) shall 'care with all solicitude for the infirm and youthful'; there is to be (c. 34) 'a considering of infirmities'; and (c. 36) 'before and above all else, attention shall be paid to the care of the sick'; to the aged and youthful (c. 37). The Abbat is to take into consideration the infirmities of the weak, and apporportion to them lighter labour (c. 48), and 'he shall so temper all things that there may be both what the strong desire, and the weak do not flee' (c. 64), remembering the considerateness of St. James, who said, 'If I overdrive my flocks they will die all in one day.'

³ *Regul. S. Aug.* c. ii. 'Overcome your flesh with fastings and abstinence from food, as far as your health permits. When, however, some one cannot fast, let him not take food except at mealtimes, unless he be sick. . . . If those who are weakly . . . are treated differently in their way of living, it ought not to be a grievance, or appear unjust, to those whom another mode of life has made stronger. . . . For it is better to want less than to have more' (J. Willis Clark, p. 5 f.)

all. 'Home,' writes Mr. Taunton, 'is the very idea of a benedictine monastery.'¹ The Rule of St. Benedict reminds the Abbat that he is a Superior, but also makes it clear that he is *father of a family*;² and the Cellarer, to whom they look for their daily food, is to be as a *father* to the whole convent.³ Our *observancie* are still more touchingly careful. For as the Prelate⁴ is said to be the father of the monastery, who in spiritual and temporal things has full authority,⁵ so a tenderer, more maternal care is to be supplied by the second in authority, the Sub-Prior, or Provost⁶ (*supprior, prepositus*), who is, as it were, the mother of this spiritual family.⁷ And nothing is more remarkable throughout than the stress which is laid upon the necessity of gentleness and courtesy on the part of all the Obedientiaries,⁸ or those who hold office in the monastery. The following, chosen at random, may serve as a specimen :

'The Sub-Cellarer should be obliging, of a cheerful countenance, temperate in his answers, courteous to strangers, and of polished manners (*moribus ornatum*), so that he may not only not speak harshly himself, but may know how to bear with equanimity the hard words of others, and when he has no substance to distribute, may hand out a gentle reply (*responsio mollis porrigatur*), for a soft answer turneth away wrath. Should a brother make an unreasonable request, he is not to vex him by a contemptuous answer, but to refuse his improper demands by reasoning gently with him' (p. 185).

¹ i. 47.

² *Regul. S. Bened.* c. 2.

³ *Ibid.* c. 31. 'Pater totius congregationis debet esse.' In some houses, as at Abingdon, the Kitchener appears to have ranked before the Cellarer, and this description is applied to him: 'Coquinarus debet esse humilis corde, benignus animo, misericordia exuberans, parvus sibi, largus aliis, solamen tristium, infirmorum refugium, sobrius et timoratus, indigentium clipeus, omnium in congregatione pater et patronus.' Daily, after Mass, he is to visit the sick, and to ask them 'quomodo se habeant, quod appetant' (*Chron. Monast. de Abingdon*, ii. 391.)

⁴ So he was called at Barnwell. In other Augustinian houses he was called Abbat (as at St. Victor's, Paris) or Prior (as at Walsingham or West Acre).

⁵ 'Prelatum appellat patrem monasterii qui in spiritualibus et temporalibus plenam habet potestatem' (p. 36).

⁶ He is also called *custos ordinis*, which Mr. J. Willis Clark renders 'Warden of the Order.'

⁷ 'Honour and respect ought to be shown to him as to a mother' (p. 55). Those who are sick are to go to him, the *custos ordinis*; and 'he, pitying them like a mother, will tenderly give them leave to enter the Farmery'—the Infirmary (p. 207).

⁸ So called as being in a special relation of obedience to the abbat, and no doubt with especial reference to our Lord's words, 'Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant' (St. Matt. xx. 26-7).

If we ask ourselves what was the *object* of this spiritual family, the answer is no less clear. The modern view which would see in the monastery a great centre from which work was to be done in the world outside, is no less mistaken than the older view which regarded it as a refuge for the destitute and a home for the broken-down. No doubt, later on, when they became the owners of the tithes of many benefices, monks were sometimes sent to serve the churches; and no doubt on great days abbats or other learned men used to preach to the people outside.¹ But the monastic life was regarded not as a means to an end but as an end in itself. Those who took part in it did so not with a view to the due performance of some other order of life, but for its own sake.

No doubt, this life was regarded as having its bearing upon the world outside; by a kind of division of labour the monk was engaged in God's warfare,² carrying on his service of prayer and fast and worship whilst the soldier or husbandman outside was doing his special task; and each was thus necessary to the other. Still the monastic life was an end in itself, apart from the life of secular men, and having nothing directly to do with it, excepting so far as rents and supplies were concerned. The life was eminently a self-centred one; and this, as experience soon proved, was at once its strength and its weakness. The monk's primary duty was the performance of the services in church; and after this came the daily round of life in accordance with the Rule.

It will be seen at once how great an importance the Rule had in the monastic life. It was divided into portions, one of which was read daily in Chapter; at Barnwell it was also read through on Saturdays at dinner, and occasionally at other times (p. 161). This is a pretty severe test to apply to any writing, and it is no slight evidence of the real greatness of the Rules of the great founders that they were able to endure it. That they did so is owing to their magnificent breadth and wisdom; in the rather ludicrous language of the writer of the *Observances*, with regard to the Rule of St.

¹ The case of Abbat Sampson of Bury is well known, who 'was eloquent both in Latin and French, though he cared more for the substance of what was said than for the style of words. He could read English writing very accurately, and used to preach to the people in English as well as in the speech of Norfolk, where he was born and bred' (Jocelin de Brakelond, *Chron.* s.a. 1187).

² The Canons Regular are called soldiers of the Rule of Augustine on p. 233; and this description is a very common one. But is it not a little absurd to suggest, as Mr. J. Willis Clark does (p. lxxix f.), that this analogy 'may have been carried a step further, and the dress of monks borrowed from that of Roman soldiers'?

Augustine, 'an elephant can swim in it, and a lamb can walk in safety.'¹

The *Observances* proceed to give particulars as to the constitution of the house. We are not told how many brethren there were at Barnwell at this time; under Jolan of Thorley, Prelate from 1254 to 1266, the number was raised to thirty (p. xvi), and it would seem to have been about the same at this time. This was a fair size for an Augustinian house; Walsingham Priory in 1514 had only twenty-nine canons and two novices, and Westacre Priory in the same year had only twenty canons.² And neither seems to have been any larger during the twenty years before and after that date. Benedictine houses ran larger; the ideal number was seventy, but apparently this was rarely reached in English houses. St. Swithun's at Winchester had as many as sixty-four monks in 1325,³ but it generally fell considerably below this. At the visitation of Norwich Priory in 1514 two of the monks said that their number ought to be sixty, but had fallen to forty or thirty-eight.⁴ And although great houses like St. Albans and Westminster may have exceeded these numbers, there can have been very few that did so.

The canons or monks, however, formed but a section of the total inhabitants of a monastery. According to St. Benedict's Rule, indeed, manual labour formed an essential part of the life of a monastery, and it was intended that the brethren should share the duties of the household.⁵ And this was probably the case at first with the Austin Canons. But at the date of the *Observance* this had long ceased to be the case. (a) By this time, as generally afterwards, English monks and nuns, canons and canonesses, were, as a rule, well-to-do if not well-born, sprung from the lesser gentry or the

¹ 'Love, therefore, passionately the Rule which that holy man set forth, and walk in accordance with it. Turn not aside to right or left. For his Rule is simple and easy, so that unlearned men and little children can walk in it without stumbling. On the other hand, it is deep and lofty, so that the wise and strong can find in it matter for abundant and perfect contemplation. An elephant can swim in it, and a lamb can walk in safety' (p. 231).

² *Norwich Visitations*, pp. 113 f., 101 f.

³ The list is given in Dr. Kitchin's *Introduction* to the St. Swithun's *Comptus Rolls*, p. 12. After that date the highest number is forty-three (in 1532-3), and the lowest twenty-nine (in 1495-6) (p. 16).

⁴ Dompnus Andreas Ryngland said thirty-eight, Guillelmus Wingfield forty (*Norwich Visitations*, p. 71 sq.). There are thirty-nine names given at the next visitation, in 1526 (*ib.* p. 196 sq.).

⁵ *Regula S. Benedicti*, cc. 35, 48.

prosp
a cert
the fo
this, i
the po
were
been
house
(in ac
able m
various
these
mason
that t
(b) T
servie
unqu
vocat
they v
Ordin

'I
are in
Regul
spiritu
in thin
unless

These
numb
gener
were
the v
Barn
on in

1 P
howev
2 S
3 A
of sub
4 L
5 L
minis
6 I
out of
the cl
7 J

prosperous trading classes.¹ There had arisen amongst them a certain feeling of superiority to manual labour ; and although the foundation of the Cistercians marks a reaction against this, it never really died away.² Moreover, as time went on, the possessions (and therefore the responsibilities) of the houses were continually increasing ; so that it would not longer have been possible that the brethren should do all the work of the house. Consequently, at Barnwell and elsewhere, there was (in addition to the tenants of the monastery) a very considerable number of household servants (p. lvi) working under the various officers of the house. It is hard to tell how many of these there were ; but, what with bakers and tailors and masons,³ we shall not be wrong in thinking, with Dr. Kitchin, that they sometimes exceeded the number of the brethren.⁴ (b) This led to a further development. In many cases these *servientes*, or *ministri*, as they were sometimes called,⁵ though unqualified for the work of the cloister, might have a real vocation for the religious life. In course of time, therefore, they were admitted as lay-brethren⁶ (*fratres conversi*), and the *Ordinances* provide for them as follows :—

‘ Lay-brethren are not to be admitted to the habit, unless they are instructed in some craft which is useful to the monastery ; for, as Regular Canons ought to be occupied day and night in things spiritual, so lay-brethren ought to labour for the profit of the Church in things corporeal, for in a monastery no one ought to eat his bread unless he work for it ’ (p. 223).

These, probably, were comparatively few at first, but grew in number as time went on. (c) Moreover there was, as a general thing, a school in each monastery, in which boys were educated not only for the cloister, but for the work of the world outside. It is apparently not mentioned in the Barnwell Customs, but we know that it was to be found later on in many other Augustinian houses,⁷ and probably it was

¹ Kitchin, *ubi sup.* p. 16 ; Jessopp, p. xxx *sq.* In the smaller houses, however, they were probably still of a somewhat lower class.

² See Kitchin, *ubi sup.* pp. 29, 42.

³ At Bury, Sampson was master of the workmen by virtue of his office of sub-sacrist.

⁴ *Ubi sup.* p. 43.

⁵ E.g. at Abingdon : *Chron. Monasterii de Abingdon*, ii. 384, *duos ministros sacristarius conducet* ; p. 390, *ministri sartorii*, &c.

⁶ It is far more probable that these *fratres conversi* were developed out of the *servientes* than that they were gradually differentiated from the cloistered monks or canons regular.

⁷ E.g. at the Bishop of Norwich's visitation in 1492 complaint was

so here. The number of boys, however, was much smaller than we might have expected; at St. Swithun's, Winchester, there were only two in 1381-2 and 1389-90; in the existing rolls the number never rises higher than eight (in 1469-70), and twice, in 1484-5 and 1516-7, there are none at all.¹ (d) And in addition to these, there were necessarily such persons as were undergoing their noviciate, of course only a very few at any particular time. These were to be sifted with the greatest care: 'in selecting novices, the brethren should be careful not to choose those of whose election they may afterwards repent' (p. 121). The person so chosen is to be formally received by the convent, to be shaven and clothed 'in new drawers, shirt, gaiters, shoes, and fur-cloak,'² with his gown and amice, surplice, and choir-cope (*capam nigram*), and then to enter upon his year's training. In a Benedictine house the Novice Master was a fixed officer; but apparently at Barnwell the novice was only handed over to one of the brethren specially chosen.³ By him he was instructed in everything that it behoved him to know, the instructions

made that the gentlemen's sons in the school at Westacre Priory do not pay for their food (*Norwich Visitations*, p. 50).

In Lanfranc's *Constitutions* the brethren are told to listen to the master as he teaches the boys; and by degrees he seems to have developed into a teacher of the brethren. For at this same Visitation the Bishop's commissaries reported that there ought to be a grammar master, 'ad docendum juniores grammaticam,' and at Butley and Walsingham canons complained that 'non habent præceptorem ad docendum eos grammaticam' (*ib.* pp. 28, 54, 59).

¹ Kitchin, *ubi sup.* p. 17.

² Mr. Taunton gives, from the *Liber Eliensis*, the following very interesting outfit of a novice at Ely:—

'*Necessaria noviciis noviter ad religionem venientibus providenda. Imprimis i matras. Item ii par blankettys. Item ii par straglys [sheets?]. Item ii couveryltes. Item i furrupane. Item i blewbed de sago [curtains of serge]. Item i cuculla cum froco. Item i tunica nigra furra. Item i tunica nigra simplex. Item ii tunica alba. Item i amita simplex [amice]. Item i zona cum i powch, cultela, tabula et pectine, filo et acu in les powch. Item i parva zona pro noctibus. Item iii par stramainoraw [woollen vests]. Item iiiii par bracarum cum brygerdel [girdle] et poyntes. Item ii par caligarum. Item iiiii par de le sokke. Item ii par botarum pro diebus. Item i par botarum pro noctibus. Item i pylche [= toga pellicea]. Item iii par flammeole [kerchiefs?]. Item iii pulvonaria [pillows]. Item i pileo albo pro noctibus [nightcap]. Item ii manutergia [towels]. Item i pokett pro vestibus lavandis [soiled clothes' bag]. Item i schavyn cloth. Item i crater a bowl [lamp?]. Item i ciphus murreus [goblet for drinking]. Item i coclear argent [silver spoon].'*

It is interesting to compare this list with that which is given in the *Regula S. Benedicti* (c. 55):—a cowl, a gown, hose, boots, a girdle, knife, a pen, needle, handkerchief, tablets.

³ 'Tradit eum magistro suo ad docendum ordinem suum' (p. 125).

given
receiv

T
demo
ought
the R
body
His w
that a
difficu
elsew
religio
nary a
certain
of Ob
by the

¹ T
ster no
compor
trauers
cum ut
doceatu
cionem
aqua be
et quali
necessa
quomoc
est ad n
suis et
profund

² A
such un
³ T
were th
those at
Visitati

⁴ Ro
⁵ Cl
⁶ P
as at St
convent
other m
count o
granted

⁷ P
the cons
Augusti
names s
i. 280).
in the cl
by the A

given being extraordinarily minute,¹ and then at length is received, the form of profession being very beautiful.²

The government of a religious house was in no sense democratic.³ It was, indeed, recognized that the Abbat ought to consult the whole society assembled in Chapter; and the Rule of St. Benedict specially provided that the whole body ought to be taken into counsel, since God often reveals His will to the more youthful.⁴ But it was acutely perceived that a large body is by no means suitable for consultation in difficult matters; and accordingly at Barnwell (as, indeed, elsewhere)⁵ the Prelate was to consult 'the more prudent and religious brethren' in difficult matters.⁶ Moreover, the ordinary administration of the house was placed in the hands of certain officers who, as we have already seen, bore the name of *Obedientiaries*. These were chosen out of the whole body by the Prelate, and were removable at his will.⁷ And in all

¹ The following passages may suffice: 'In principio igitur docebit magister nouicium, qualiter stando et qualiter sedendo habitum suum circa se componet; secundo qualiter debeat inclinare profunde, ita quod manus ex trauerso attingere possint usque ad genua, et quod in omni inclinacione cum utraque manu signum crucis faciat coram se cum habitu. . . . Deinde doceatur qualiter se habere debet ad uesperas, et ad cenam, et ad collationem, et completorium, et ad trinam oracionem, et qualiter, accepta aqua benedicta, uelato capite transibit per claustrum usque in dormitorium, et qualiter calciamenta sua sub habitu suo deponet, et modum sedendi in necessariis. Deinde magister suus iuxta eum erit quando cubabit, et quomodo habitum suum supra se componet indicabit. Quando surgendum est ad matutinas, magister ueniet ad nouicium et adiuuabit eum de uestibus suis et calciamentis, deinde facit eum sedere coram lecto suo, capite in profundo capucii cooperto' (p. 125 sq.).

² At St. Augustine's, Canterbury, a novice did not actually cease to be such until he was ordained priest (Taunton, p. 294).

³ The only religious bodies in England upon a 'republican' basis were the College of Secular Canons at Southwell and, in a lesser degree, those at Ripon and Exeter. See Mr. A. F. Leach's *Introduction to the Visitations of Southwell Minster* (Camden Society), pp. xxxiv-vii.

⁴ *Regul. S. Bened.* c. 3.

⁵ Cf. Kitchin, *ubi sup.* p. 50.

⁶ P. 40; similar cases are mentioned on p. xxxv. Probably here, also, as at St. Victor's, the Prelate was elected by brethren chosen out of the convent, and not by the whole number. This was the case with most other monastic bodies; that is, as readers of Jocelin de Brakelond's account of the election of Abbat Sampson will remember, if the king granted them a free election.

⁷ P. 41. The Sub-Prior, however, must be chosen, and removed, with the consent of the saner part of the congregation (pp. 50, 51). At St. Augustine's, Canterbury, the Prior was chosen by the Abbat out of three names submitted to him by the convent (Taunton, *English Black Monks*, i. 280). In some other houses, as at Abingdon, the monks had a voice in the choosing of all the chief officers. For instance, the Prior is chosen by the Abbat out of two names selected by twelve delegates of the con-

this it was made quite clear, at any rate at Barnwell, that they were only acting by his authority, and that the sole authority finally lay in him.¹ Elsewhere, and especially in the larger houses, the offices tended to become permanent; but even so the Abbat might take particular offices into his own hands, when they had been badly administered, and not infrequently did so.²

The number of Obedientiaries, and indeed the particular functions with which they were entrusted, varied not a little in different houses. At Barnwell they were the Sub-Prior, third Prior, Precentor (*Cantor*) or Armarius, Succentor, Sacrist, Sub-Sacrist, Cellarer, Grainger, Receiver, Sub-Cellarer, Frater (*Refectorarius*), Kitchener, Chamberlain, Hosteller³ or Hospitaller, Master of the Farmery (*Infirmarius*), and Almoner. And as it is recognized that their work will necessitate their absence from some of the daily offices, they are here, as elsewhere, severally excused from attendance at some of them in case of necessity.⁴

Of these officers, the Sub-Prior is in charge of the ordinary internal life of the house, since it is recognized that the Prelate will frequently be absent,⁵ either employed upon its business or upon such important external affairs as may be entrusted to him.⁶ In his absence the Sub-Prior takes his vent (*Chron. Monast. de Abingdon*, ii. 355); the Sub-Prior 'consilio abbatis, et dispositione prioris et maturiorum de conventu' (p. 366); the Precentor 'dispositione abbatis, et consilio prioris et subprioris et maturiorum de conventu' (p. 369); the Kitchener 'dispositione abbatis et assensu capituli' (p. 391), and so on.

¹ 'The Prelate ought to have full power in his monastery, but the Sub-Prior and the other inferior officers only part of the trouble' (p. 145).

² The Abbat Sampson at Bury, for example, took the Cellarship and Hospitallership into his own hands; and in 1336 Prior Heryard of St. Swithun's took the Hordarian's office and entrusted it to the Receiver (Kitchin, *ubi sup.* p. 62). It is a frequent cause of complaint in the *Norwich Visitations* that things of this kind had been done; and the Visitor never makes any injunction on the subject unless it is clear that the house is suffering loss thereby.

³ According to Dr. Kitchin (*ubi sup.* p. 80) at St. Swithun's, Winchester, the *Hostillarius* had already come to be no more than the Porter, and the Guest-master was a distinct officer.

⁴ On p. liv Mr. J. Willis Clark seems to be mistaken in saying that the Almoner was not allowed any relaxation from the daily services, &c. He was to attend them *quantum potest*.

⁵ The Prelate gradually came to be regarded as, in a sense, external to the house. He might be in charge of more houses than one (p. 47); and at St. Victor's he might even be chosen from outside the Augustinian Order (Martene, iii. 253).

⁶ He is to inform the Sub-Prior if he intends to be away only for a single night (p. 55), and is to inform the brethren in Chapter of the object of his journey either before or after it is made, and to receive a

1898

plac
so f
up t

all th
more
his a
who
the s
in th
weak
staff

relat
mate
notic

'
Prelat
milk,
dum
vided
them
shoul
him a
proper
the he
acting
betwe
and so
Spirit,
in thei
easy yo

TH
Sub-P
circuit
that c
elsewh
At Ba
cedenc

formal
'sine be
three da
' At
fourth P
the Exp
VOL.

place in the daily Chapter, and performs his other functions so far as possible ; and accordingly his authority is to be kept up to the full :

'The Prelate ought strongly to support his Sub-Prior more than all the rest ; to befriend him and to help him by word and deed in a more kindly spirit ; and especially, so that order may be kept and his authority may not be impaired, he ought to discountenance those who would resist or slander him. The Prelate ought always to take the side of his Sub-Prior, until something is made out against him in the way of legitimate proof ; for his authority will soon be weakened by those who wish him ill, if he be not supported by the staff of the Prelate' (p. 146 sq.).

At the same time, the Sub-Prior is carefully to cultivate a relation of less strictness towards the Canons ; and that tender maternal relation towards them, which we have already noticed, is again insisted upon :

'The Sub-Prior ought to occupy a position midway between the Prelate and the convent, and, that he may provide them with sweet milk, ought to have as it were the breasts of a mother (*ad propinandum dulcedinem lactis, habere debet ubera matris*). Therefore, provided the Order suffer no harm, he ought to be prodigal towards them of consolation and friendship, sweetness and goodwill ; he should temper the strictness of their father, and intervene between him and them, so that everything that is necessary for them may be properly supplied. Besides, he ought, as far as possible, to direct the hearts of all the brethren to love of the Prelate. . . . By carefully acting in this manner he will be able to keep peace and tranquillity between the Prelate and the brethren, like a mother between father and sons ; he will be able, on each day, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, to close the Chapter in the peace of Christ ; and the brethren, in their turn, will enjoy tranquillity among themselves, and bear the easy yoke of the Lord with lightness of heart' (p. 147).

The Third Prior acted in like manner as the deputy of the Sub-Prior ; and moreover had, like him, to make a nightly circuit of the whole monastery, to see that all was secure, and that discipline was being duly observed—a function which elsewhere procured for him the title of *Explorator ordinis*.¹ At Barnwell he was not an important person, and had precedence neither in Chapter nor in Choir by virtue of his office

formal blessing (p. 47). At Abingdon, the Abbat could go to his manor 'sine benedictione ;' but if he was going to Court, or for more than a three days' journey, he was to go 'cum benedictione' (*Chron.* ii. 349).

¹ At St. Augustine's, Canterbury, this title was borne by the third and fourth Priors (Taunton, *ubi sup.* pp. 261, 282). At Abingdon, however, the Explorator is apparently a different officer (*Chron.* ii. 367-8).

(p. 59). Elsewhere, however, he was more important; and, indeed, sometimes there was a fourth or even a fifth Prior.¹

We pass on to the Precentor or Armarius with his assistant, the Succentor. He was, in his twofold capacity, one of the most important officers of the house.² In his hands, in his former capacity, was the entire responsibility for the services. He arranged the rota of those who were to take part in them, and drew up the notice-board (*tabula*) upon which their names were inscribed. He chose the music and led the singing,³ arranged the processions, corrected the pronunciation of the readers,⁴ and in fact ruled the choir in every detail.⁵

This, however, is but one of the duties of the Precentor; as librarian he is in charge of all the books of the house, not only such as are used in choir. He has to know them, to see that they are in good order, free from injury by insects or decay, and to bind them where necessary, apparently with his own hands.⁶ He points the service-books for use in choir, lends out those which are to be read by the brethren, and is responsible for the safe return of such as are lent outside.⁷ He chooses the readers at meals, and sees that they are provided with the proper books. Further, he has charge of all writings, writing materials, and it is his business to hire writers from outside if necessary. He provides writing materials for such of the brethren as propose to write 'books of

¹ At St. Augustine's, Canterbury, there were a third and fourth priors; at St. Swithun's there was only occasionally a fourth Prior (Kitchin, p. 40); at Norwich there was a *quintus Prior* (*Norwich Visitations*, p. 202).

² At St. Augustine's, Canterbury, he actually had the privilege of nominating one of the three selected for the posts of prior, almoner, and sacrist (*Taunton, ubi sup.* p. 284).

³ 'The Precentor . . . is fittingly so called as being the chief of the singers, or the leading singer, or the foremost singer, or the singer who sings remarkably, or surpassingly, or better than the rest' (p. 66). Mr. J. Willis Clark's rendering hardly brings out the force of the *quasi*. The Succentor was to be 'in cantu peritum, in uoce potentem' (p. 60).

⁴ At Abingdon he also administered corporal punishment to the boys. 'Cantor, pro transgressione mendacii et negligencia in choro officii, puerorum aures erigat, capillos distrahet, manu cædet' (*Chron.* ii. 370).

⁵ 'Sicut dissolvitur conventus privatione priorum, sic labitur chorus absentia cantorum' (*ibid.* ii. 374). Accordingly, the Precentor or Succentor is always to be present.

⁶ The books 'ought to be properly bound by him' (*per ipsum debent honeste ligari*), p. 64. So also at Abingdon (*Chron.* ii. 371).

⁷ 'Nor ought the Librarian himself to lend books [to others, known or unknown] unless he receive a pledge of equal value; and then he ought to enter on his roll the name of the borrower, the title of the book lent, and the pledge taken' (p. 63).

gene
obta
further
the c
hous
Pop
he o
decis
(p. 6
A
well
the

with
book
tally
be se
injur

By t
'a re
dral
the v
signi
walls
siste

J
hold
were
remo
whic
doul
Earl
Arm
don,
and
latte
of t
And
the l
tury

(Chr
work

general use to the community,' provided that they have obtained the permission of the Prelate. And this leads to a further function of the Precentor, in which he corresponds to the Chancellor of a cathedral. He keeps the records of the house¹ and writes letters in its name. And 'if our Lord the Pope should send to him in writing his decision of any cause, he ought to consult the Prelate, and in accordance with his decision (*secundum eius arbitrium*) enforce it or register it' (p. 67 sq.).

A word must be said about the Library itself. At Barnwell, at the time of our *Observances*, the books were kept in the *Armarium* (or *Almarium*), of which we are told that

'The press in which the books are kept ought to be lined inside with wood, that the damp of the walls may not moisten or stain the books. This press should be divided vertically as well as horizontally by sundry shelves on which the books may be ranged, so as to be separated from one another, for fear they be packed so close as to injure each other or delay those who want them' (p. 65).

By the *almarium*, in other words,

'a recess in the wall, such as may still be seen at Worcester Cathedral or at the Cluniac Priory of Castle Acre, is clearly meant. Had the word been used merely for a piece of furniture, which is its usual signification, the lining of it with wood, so that "the damp of the walls may not moisten or stain the books," would not have been insisted upon' (p. xxxix).

But before long this *armarium* had become too large to hold all the books. Accordingly, whilst the service-books were still kept in it, the increasing list of other books was removed to a new resting-place, the Library (*bibliotheca*), which may also have been in the cloister, perhaps.² No doubt this took place at different times in different houses. Early in the fourteenth century the Precentor was still called *Armarius* at St. Augustine's, Canterbury,³ whereas at Abingdon, at the end of the thirteenth century, the *armarium* and the *bibliotheca* were already separated; and whilst the latter remained under the charge of the Precentor, the keys of the former remained under the charge of the Succentor.⁴ And, once again, there is extant a portion of a catalogue of the library at Bury, 'of late twelfth or early thirteenth century date,' consisting of some 267 items, in which the service-

¹ At Abingdon 'omnes ecclesie cartæ cantori erunt assignatæ' (*Chron.* ii. 373).

² The cloister was of course glazed, and formed, in fact, the ordinary working-place of the brothers.

³ Taunton, *ubi sup.* p. 283.

⁴ *Chron.* ii. 373-4.

books and lectionaries, some seventeen in number, are lined through.¹ This, no doubt, marks the formal separation of the service-books from the library proper.

Such, then, was the usual arrangement of the books of a mediæval monastery: there were, as Mabillon has said,² two distinct collections, one of service-books³ and the other of the library proper. This latter grew very greatly as time went on, as we know in the case of Bury, thanks to the researches of Dr. M. R. James. From these it would appear that a separate library building was constructed at Bury about 1430, at which period many other English libraries were built;⁴ that it contained Hebrew manuscripts amongst others;⁵ and that there is every reason to believe that it numbered, not 'three hundred or more codices,' which Dr. Kitchin guessed as the size of a good monastic library,⁶ but actually over 2,000!⁷

Passing on to other Obedientiaries, the Sacrist, or *Secretarius* as he was sometimes called,⁸ together with his assistant, the Sub-Sacrist⁹ or *Matricularius*, had charge of the fabric of the church and all that it contained, the graveyard, and all that was required for the services of the church.¹⁰ He likewise provided the whole house with candles as might be required, and, through his assistant, was in charge of all the bells of the house. It is worthy of notice that the sacrists both ate and slept in the Church; for we are told that 'the guardians of the Church must take their meals in it, but they must not invite any secular persons to dinner without leave, nor retain

¹ James, *The Abbey of St. Edmund at Bury*, pp. 23-33. A list of some thirty-three books, now existing, which belonged to the abbey, but were not part of the library proper, is given in pp. 89-99.

² Quoted in Kitchin, *ubi sup.* p. 87. He is wrong, however, in saying that the church books were *always* under the care of the Precentor.

³ Together with other books for edification which, according to the custom of certain French houses at any rate, were laid out for general use (J. Willis Clark, p. xlvi *sq.*).

⁴ James, p. 41.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 3.

⁶ Kitchin, *ubi sup.* p. 88.

⁷ James, pp. 3, 99. Three hundred and one volumes are still in existence.

⁸ At Abingdon (*Chron.* ii. 374). Martene explains it 'qui ecclesiæ secretum curat' (*De Ritibus Ecclesiæ*, iv. 419); but the explanation is a very doubtful one.

⁹ At Abingdon (*ut sup.* 383, *sq.*) there were two—*secundus* and *tertius secretarius*, together with *quartus minister* and the *ministros*. At St. Augustine's, Canterbury, two Sub-Sacrists, who could not enter the sacristy without leave, a *Revestiarius*, and a companion (Taunton, p. 285).

¹⁰ At Abingdon he was to provide that the church should be swept out once a year, on the Tuesday in the Holy Week (*Chron.* ii. 378).

then
great
impos
he ra

T
will c
office.
of a s
matte
Prelat
estate
we sh
care o
warne
of the
the p

'V
withou
round
summe
heat o
to give
may g
burnt,

TI
matro
water
He w
be sen
in wir
make
likewi
due s
well f

¹ A
Transe
factory
Refecto
i.e. in t

² K
³ C
⁴ A
signifi
comple
397).

⁵ J.
⁶ T

them to pass the night with them'¹ (p. 75). Naturally, in a great cathedral-monastery the Sacrist's functions were very important, and we are not surprised to hear that at Lichfield he ranked next after the Prior.²

The other Obedientiaries need not detain us long, and we will only pause to notice a few particular points about their office. The *Cellarer*,³ who in other houses had to do the work of a steward, was, at Barnwell, the Prelate's right-hand man in matters temporal; and, 'provided they were unanimous,' the Prelate and the Cellarer 'could do what they pleased with the estates belonging to the house'⁴ (p. xlvi). The duties which we should more naturally have associated with his name—the care of food and drink—fell upon the Sub-Cellarer. He is warned to be on his guard against the peculations and waste of the servants; and again, in the following passage, to see to the proper supplying of food:

'When new barrels are filled with beer they are not to be left without some one to watch them. In winter straw is to be placed round the barrels, and, if need be, a fire is to be lighted. In summer the windows of the cellar are to be closed, to prevent the heat of the sun reaching the barrels. The [Sub-] Cellarer ought not to give new beer to the convent to drink until the fourth day. He may give them warm bread, but it must not be dirty, broken, or burnt, or gnawed by mice' (p. 185).

The *Chamberlain*, who discharged the duties 'of the matron of a large school,'⁵ was to provide soap and warm water on shaving days, and for baths when they were required. He was to provide a laundress, to whom clothes were to be sent 'once a fortnight in summer, and once in three weeks in winter;' and if any articles were lost, the laundress is to make good the deficiency out of her wages (p. 195). He is likewise over the tailory, is to see that the Canons receive the due supplies of clothing,⁶ and that they are well made and well fitting. Elsewhere, too, he had charge of the dorter

¹ At Winchester the Sacrist dwelt 'in the last bay of the South Transept, on the level of the Triforium, and over the offices and Calfactory' (Kitchin, p. 47). At Abingdon the Sub-Sacrist dined in the Refectory before the brethren, but slept, like the Sacrist, *in monasterio*, i.e. in the church (*Chron.* ii. 382-3).

² Kitchin, p. 46 (from Dugdale).

³ Called also the *Chief* or External Cellarer (pp. 181, 161).

⁴ At Abingdon the duties of the cellarer may be gathered from one significant entry: 'Ad misericordias, ad prandium, post prandium, post completorium, cervisia copiose per cellararium propinabitur' (*Chron.* ii. 397).

⁵ J. Willis Clark, p. li.

⁶ The list is a long and interesting one (p. 197).

(dormitory).¹ The *Hosteller* had charge of the guest-house, a most important charge at a time when the monasteries were the only inns, and a large monastery received all guests who might come to its doors, so far as might be. At Barnwell the guests certainly have no right to complain :

'It is part of the Hosteller's duty to be careful that perfect cleanliness and propriety should be found in his department, namely to keep clean cloths and clean towels ; cups without flaws ; spoons of silver ; mattresses, blankets, sheets not merely clean but untorn ; proper pillows, quilts to cover the beds of full width and length and pleasing to the eyes of those who enter the room ; a proper laver of metal ; a bason clean both inside and out ; in winter a candle and candlestick ; fire that does not smoke ; boxes ; clean salt in salt-cellers that have been well scrubbed ; food served in porringers that have been well washed and are unbroken ; the whole Guest-House kept clear of spider's-webs and dirt, and strewn with rushes underfoot ; a supply of hay in the necessary-house, and the seats covered ; a sufficient quantity of straw in the beds ; keys and locks to the doors, and good bolts on the inside, so as to keep the doors securely closed while the guests are asleep' (p. 193).

This presents to us a standard of comfort, and, indeed, of refinement, which we might hardly have expected at the end of the thirteenth century ; and there are many things which serve to show that it was not absent from the life of the brethren themselves. The *Fraterer*, for instance, is to see that rushes and mats are placed in the Frater (Refectory),² and frequently to renew them ; to make a sweet odour in summer with flowers, mint, &c. ; to see that the kitchen hatch is kept clean, and the lavatory, and to see that a whetstone and sand are kept there that the brethren may be able to sharpen their knives ; to take care that the beer is freshly drawn before meals. And the *Kitchener* is to supervise the kitchen cooks carefully ; to see that 'food is not served to the convent in vessels that are broken or dirty, and that they are not dirty on the under side, so as to stain the tablecloths ;' and to give the cooks due notice 'when service in the choir will be protracted or shortened, that they may know when they should be expeditious in getting dinner ready, and when they should keep it back' (p. 189, cf. p. 163). Altogether, the picture that is presented to us is that of a life which is frugal indeed, but decidedly above the scale of refinement of the day.

¹ *Chron. Monast. de Abingdon*, ii. 386, 'Ad priorem pertinet loci donatio, ad camerarium lecti remotio.'

² Mr. Taunton confounds the Frater with the Calefactory (i. 86).

of the
regre
Clar
out,
'hou
but t
into
(p. x
for M
nigh
dayb
to w
for P
work
'of th
corre

'T
corre
to wh
to per
are m
this b
which

A
which
then,
Mass
Dinn
and t
taken

D
made

1 P
to the
2 T
monas
3 T
dinner
4 P
infirm
Benet
that h
prout
5 I
erack
as not

We have left ourselves but little space in which to speak of the occupations of a monastic day,¹ and it is the less to be regretted, because of the thorough way in which Mr. Willis Clark has dealt with it (pp. lxxxii-xcvi). He has pointed out, more clearly than we have ever seen it put before, that the 'hours' of a monastic day were not hours of sixty minutes, but that the period between sunrise and sunset was divided into twelve equal portions.² The time-table that he gives us (p. xcvi) is quite admirable.³ The brethren rose at midnight for Nocturns (Mattins and Lauds), which they said in their night clothes, and after this they retired again to bed. At daybreak they were called, went from the dorter to the lavatory to wash their faces and comb their hair, and went into church for Prime, after which followed private Masses, confessions, or work. Then followed the daily Chapter, in which the services of the day were gone through; faults were confessed and corrected, and other business done.

'To what extent, however, and in what way, brethren ought to correct their faults, what penances are to be imposed upon them, to what extent brethren ought to humiliate themselves in submitting to penance, and how they ought to behave after they have submitted, are matters that ought not to be written down here, lest a sight of this book should make known to strangers the secrets of the Chapter, which God forbid' (p. 143).

After Chapter the brethren were free to talk until Terce, which was followed on ordinary days by the High Mass, and then, at the sixth hour, by Sext. On fast days, however, High Mass was postponed till after Sext and followed by None. Dinner followed Sext in the former case, None in the latter; and this, we must remember, was the first food that had been taken by the majority of them.⁴

Dinner was eaten in silence,⁵ all communications being made by means of signs; and during the meal an appointed

¹ In what follows we have confined ourselves, for the sake of brevity, to the life of the Augustinian Canons.

² The water-clock was thus a very important institution in a monastery.

³ There is one error. The reader at table dined after, not before, the dinner of the convent (see p. 162).

⁴ Bread steeped in wine, or wine and water, was allowed to the infirm at Barnwell, and perhaps elsewhere. At the Visitation of St. Benet at Hulme in 1494 complaint was made against the Sub-Cellarer that he did not prepare for the novices 'repastum matutinum cotidie prout semper fieri consuevit' (*Norwich Visitations*, p. 61).

⁵ If there were nuts the monk at St. Augustine's was directed not to crack them with his teeth, but to open them privately with his knife, so as not to disturb the reader (Taunton, p. 297).

book was read aloud by the Reader. And it is important to notice, with regard to the reading, that it was almost always taken from Holy Scripture :

'Moreover, the books which ought to be read at meals at different seasons of the year ought to be carried by the Librarian himself into the Frater in the following order : On each Sunday throughout the year Haymo,¹ with the epistles and gospels proper for Sundays. From Advent to Christmas let Isaiah be read. On Christmas Day, and until the Octave of the Epiphany, all the passages required are to be found in Haymo and in the Passions. From the Octave of the Epiphany to Septuagesima let the Epistles of Paul be read. From Septuagesima to Passion-Sunday let Genesis be read. From Passion-Sunday to Easter let Jeremiah be read. On Easter Day and through the Octave everything relating to Easter is read. For fifteen days after Low Sunday the Apocalypse is read. Then down to Ascension Day let the Canonical Epistles be read. From Ascension Day to Pentecost let the Acts of the Apostles be read. From Pentecost and through the Octave of the Trinity let the epistles and gospels proper to those festivals be read. From the first Sunday after the Octave of the Trinity to the Kalends of August let the Books of the Kings be read. From the Kalends of August to the Kalends of September let Solomon be read, that is the Sapiencial Books. At the beginning of September down to the middle of the month let Job be read. From the Sunday that falls in the middle of September let Tobit, Judith, and Esther be read. From the first Sunday in October down to the end of the same month let the Books of Maccabees be read. From the beginning of November to Advent let Ezekiel, Daniel, and the twelve Prophets be read' (p. 65 sq.)

The other directions with regard to the Reader are also well worthy of notice :

'The Reader at table ought not to hurry his reading with the view of reading much, but he should read clearly and distinctly so as to be understood ; and when he has found a good and noteworthy passage, he ought to repeat it again and again, that it may be thoroughly understood' (p. 159).

And at the end of the meal

'The Reader is to transfer his marker to the place where he is, and he shall put a piece of clean wax in the margin opposite to the place where he has left off' (p. 165)—

a custom which may account for many a stain on the pages of ancient lectionaries.

After dinner the brethren retire to the dorter for their siesta (*meridiana*) ; then came None (that is, on ordinary

¹ One of the most spiritual of the Bible Commentators of the Middle Ages.

days), then a drink in the frater, then work till Evensong, which was just before sunset; then supper followed after another interval for reading or work in the cloister till Collation, at which they had a drink of wine, and perhaps a piece of bread, followed by Compline, and then sleep in the dorter.

Many questions of the greatest interest have here been passed over entirely, which yet are eminently worthy of fuller study: such as the nature of the meals; the rules with regard to bleeding, shaving, and the like; the studies and relaxations of the life of the Canons Regular, their dress, and so on. Some of them will be found to be treated in Mr. Willis Clark's *Introduction*, and indeed treated exhaustively. But what has been said may serve to show some of the features of the life in its best period. No doubt later on it suffered a change for the worse. As the rulers of monasteries came to be immersed in secular business as great barons; as the Obedientiaries came to be occupied, not only with their own functions, but with the administration of the estates which supplied the funds for the many expenses of their offices; as the monasteries became more and more perplexed in their efforts to make both ends meet, the whole tone of monastic life became altered. The professed members of religious houses had always been more or less 'gentry'; now they were either members of great and powerful corporations or else sadly impoverished landholders. Neither position was likely to be good for their moral or religious life; although a shameful injustice has been done to them by judging them, as they have often been judged, by a few cases of sad moral disaster. We should rather recognise with Dr. Kitchen that this change in the character of the monasteries had a really good side:

'We prefer to see in the Prior [of St. Swithin's] a great noble, ruling over what was far better than a noble's fortress—a well-ordered, peaceful community, which on the one side kept up a perpetual protest against the rude vices of the age, and on the other side showed kings, nobles, and prelates who thronged our city the pattern of an organization for the conduct of life and business which could hardly have been found elsewhere in mediæval times.'¹

But, after all, the real standard by which the life of the mediæval monastery must be tested is its capacity for satisfying the spiritual needs of human beings. The life, as we have already said, was an eminently self-centred one; it was this which was at once its strength and its weakness. Its strength, for theirs was no striving after their own individual salvation;

¹ Kitchen, p. 39.

they lived as a great corporate society, following the way of God, with all the encouragements and all the strength which come from devotion to a common ideal: the society came before all else, and in the development of this corporate life was worked out much of the social progress of later days. Its weakness, for the brethren were touched but slowly by the forces which made the lives of their brethren that were in the world. They were absorbed in the petty details of their own life. The student of mediæval monastic society cannot fail to notice how tenaciously they battled for the smallest rights, as they considered them, of their society or order; and how absolutely indifferent they were very frequently to the great movements by which God was re-making the world round about them. The more large-hearted of them inevitably found occupation either in abstract study or in the business, secular or ecclesiastical, of the world outside; the rest drifted into the lazy, aimless life of mere drones. In due time self-centredness became sheer selfishness, and then their doom was sealed.

ART. X.—ECCLESIASTICAL LAW IN ENGLAND.

1. *The Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England.* By the late SIR R. PHILLIMORE. Second Edition, by his Son, SIR W. G. F. PHILLIMORE. Two Volumes. (London, 1895.)
2. *A Complete Manual of Canon Law.* Vol. I. *The Sacraments.* Vol. II. *Church Discipline.* By OSWALD J. REICHEL. (London, 1896.)
3. *Corpus Juris Canonici.* Editio Lipsiensis Secunda, edidit ÆMILIUS FRIEDBERG. (Leipzig, 1881.)
4. *The Nature and Force of the Canon Law.* By the Rev. W. E. COLLINS. A Paper read at the Third Annual Meeting of the Church Historical Society, November 4, 1897. (S.P.C.K.)

THE appearance of a second edition of Phillimore's *Ecclesiastical Law* may be hailed as a hopeful sign; for it is a large and multifarious work, and its two thick volumes are sufficiently unwieldy. That it should have to be revised and reprinted may therefore be taken as an indication that the purpose of the learned author—the late Sir Robert Phillimore—has been in some considerable measure attained. That purpose was described by himself in the preface to the

first
tint
than
this
amp
conv
of c
Bish
usu
such
Law
edit
imp
Bur
The
R.
veni
the
scie
cour
port
on v
mov
185
men
new
prac
had
omi
the
the
and
arra
for
and
in t
from
was
coul
in c
trea
cons
Bur
rem
larg

first edition, which bears date 1873, 'to promote a more continuous and systematic study of ecclesiastical jurisprudence than has for a very long period of time been prevalent in this country.' For such a study the materials were indeed ample, but the forms in which they existed were by no means convenient, or up to date, or readily available. There were, of course, the old books, Lyndwood, Oughton, Godolphin, Bishop Gibson, &c., but these were extant only in old editions, usually needing, and that badly, indices, references, and other such auxiliaries; and there was also Dr. Burn's *Ecclesiastical Law*, of which Sir R. Phillimore had himself edited a new edition of four volumes in 1842, with many additions and improvements, being the ninth issue of that standard work. Burn, however, had by 1873 become completely obsolete. The work was compiled in the dictionary form, which, as Sir R. Phillimore observed in 1873, 'however superficially convenient, appears fatal to any attempt to produce the law in the form of a system arranged according to the principles of science.' Moreover, since 1842 the jurisdiction of the Church courts has been most seriously abridged and limited, very large portions—indeed, by far the largest portion—of the subjects on which these courts anciently adjudicated having been removed to the civil courts, more especially by the legislation of 1857. This took away at one swoop the whole of the testamentary and matrimonial business, and transferred it to the new Court of Probate and Divorce, and with it the lucrative practice which the Church lawyers and the Church officials had for centuries been possessed of. Hence very considerable omissions from Burn's work were required, and the whole of the subject matter which modern legislation had still left to the Church authorities, and left in a sufficiently mutilated and fragmentary condition, needed to be remodelled and rearranged. That Sir R. Phillimore was most fully competent for this task we need not say. His erudition was in its day and way unsurpassed, and his experience from long practice in the ecclesiastical courts during their time of activity, and from his long occupation of the office of Dean of the Arches, was unique. He was probably the only man then living who could have rendered to the Church the great service he did in compiling and publishing this systematic and complete treatise on the law of the Church as it now exists. Very considerable portions have of course been incorporated from Burn, where subjects are under consideration which still remain for the cognizance of the Church courts; but a very large proportion of the contents of these volumes, both in the

first and second edition, consists of material which is new since Burn's day, Acts of Parliament and judicial decisions bearing upon the Church and her concerns having been sufficiently abundant between that time and this. Sir Walter Phillimore, the editor of the new edition—whose recent and well deserved elevation to the judicial bench our readers will have noted with pleasure—rendered great assistance to his father in the compilation of the original one, which indeed is on this ground dedicated by the father to the son, and he is thus peculiarly well fitted for the undertaking which he has so carefully and so completely accomplished in the volumes before us.

The main outlines and divisions of the earlier work are retained in the present one, and, indeed, they could hardly be improved. What has been done is substantially to bring the treatise up to date, and Sir Walter has very wisely tried to effect this without seriously adding to its bulk and cost. In order to secure this result, and yet to include the very considerable amount of fresh material which has accumulated during the last quarter of a century, Sir Walter has found it 'necessary to retrench some portions of the first edition which have in the course of time become obsolete or of less importance, and to abridge some judicial decisions which had been given at length.' A thorough examination of the work and a comparison of it with his father's warrants us in saying that this has been judiciously accomplished without the sacrifice of anything really useful to the student or the lawyer who may have to consult these pages for practical purposes. We may remark also that Sir Walter has inserted 'some information of older date which had been omitted from the earlier edition, but which the editor has found in the course of his reading.'

The work is divided into ten parts, the first being introductory, and we do not know that we could better illustrate the spirit and tone of the whole than by extracting its first short chapter, which is entitled 'The Church Generally':

'The Church is a society of men instituted for the worship of God, bound together by the profession of a common faith, the practice of ordained rites, and resting upon a visible external order.

'Such a society was unknown to heathen antiquity, and is the peculiar creature of Christianity.

'Heathen antiquity had a priesthood but not a Church. Its religion was inseparably interwoven with the civil life and municipal law of the citizen. Its creed was not a regular system of doctrine directly affecting practice, but a variety of incoherent legends and

tradi-
belie

its t
secur
cation
depen
place

of its
time
the f
unity
forme

origin
of Ro
presen
recen
which

Catho
offsho
Colon
Churc

'E
scopal
fast th
of the
avoid
Protes

T
which
opinio
volum
of con
Churc
other
and S
cum,'
and

Th
thus :

traditions mingled with remnants of Divine revelations, more or less believed by the people.

'Christianity is inseparable from a community, in which it imparts its truths by a regular course of instruction, and endeavours to secure the observance of its precepts by a moral and religious education, and, being a revelation of the will of God, is necessarily independent of municipal institutions, and unconfined to the limits of places or kingdoms.

'The Church of Christ ought to be, and once was, like the robe of its Blessed Founder and like its Faith, one. But in the lapse of time various errors have been introduced from various causes into the faith and practice of the Primitive Apostolic Church. This unity has been broken, and various communities of Christians have formed separate Churches.

'The great separation of the Eastern and Western Churches, originally caused by the arrogance, ambition, and uncatholic conduct of Rome, remains from the same cause not only unhealed up to the present day, but aggravated by the new dogmas which Rome has recently promulgated, founded upon a new theory of development which shakes the stability of all Christian Faith.

'From like causes came the independence of one branch of the Catholic Church in England, Ireland, and Scotland, and their offshoots in the United States of America, in India, in the British Colonies and in heathen lands, and of the imperfectly constituted Churches of the Protestants.

'From a like cause it seems probable that an independent Episcopal Church will be formed in Germany by those who, holding fast the ancient doctrine of the Church, and rejecting the novelties of the last Roman Council, adopt the title of "Old Catholics," and avoid the error and confusion generated by the ambiguous title of Protestant' (i. 1, 2).

This quotation serves well to exhibit the standpoint from which the authors regard the multifarious facts, laws, legal opinions, and judgments contained in these two massive volumes, and to illustrate also the habit which pervades them of commencing each several division of the great subject of Church law by setting forth its principles and origins. The other four chapters of this first part deal with the 'Character and Status of the Church of England,' the 'Jus Ecclesiasticum,' the 'Sources of the Law of the Church of England,' and 'Clergy and Laity.'

The order and contents of the following nine parts stand thus :

Part II. Orders and Offices of the Church.

Part III. The Church in her Relation to the General Life of her Members.

Part IV. Discipline of the Church.

Part V. Property of the Church.

Part VI. Fabrics and Officers of Fabrics of the Church.

Part VII. Councils of the Church.

Part VIII. The Church in her Relation to Charities and Education.

Part IX. Church Extension.

Part X. Church of England in Relation to other Churches.

The first three parts of these ten are comprised in vol. i. We must add, what is extremely important in a work of this compass and character, that most complete indices are given, comprising a List of Authorities, an Explanation of the References to Books of the Canon Law, a Table of Cases which are quoted or alluded to, a similar Table of Statutes, a List of the Canons of 1603, and at the end of the second volume a very full register of matters.

Mr. Oswald J. Reichel, to whose important work we now turn, has given much time and attention to the study of the Canon Law. It is now about nine years since he published a small book entitled *Elements of Canon Law*, which was very convenient as an introduction to the whole subject. Following up his undertaking, he now gives us the first two parts of *A Complete Manual of Canon Law*. The whole work will be comprised in four good-sized volumes, treating respectively of the Sacraments, Church Discipline, Church Government, and the Parochial System; of which the first two are now before us. This is of course not a work altogether *in pari materia* with the one edited by Sir Walter Phillimore. The latter is designed for the legal practitioner of this date, and especially for the practitioner in the Courts of the Church and State of England. Mr. Reichel takes in hand the immense theme of the Canon Law of the Church at large; and writes for the scholar, the theologian, and the student. Sir W. Phillimore only so far sets forth principles as to exhibit the reasons and grounds on which rest the actual statutes, canons, or customs which he has to record as in use; Mr. Reichel's work is distinctly theological and ecclesiastical, and traces back in all cases the rules and canons of the Church to their origin, and expounds the theory of them. Naturally also his volumes have comparatively little of a national character, though he finds himself obliged from time to time to note the post-Reformation dealings with old Church constitutions when such have taken place in the Church of England. His method is to state concisely what the Canon Law has laid down on each particular subject, and to supply in footnotes the requisite

refe
wid
is a
from
as i
to h

noth
of t
taug
not
prop
scho
form
owe
anoth
which
the E
matte
neces
sophy
Weste
this c
involv
than a
the tri
but w
humar
realitie
assert
to redu
and hu
elabora
God m
ing the

As
what
system
tion of
Canons
As Bish
and his
ancesto
general
telligen

¹ Job
² Bish

references to original authorities. In these references his very wide and varied reading, historical, antiquarian, and liturgical, is abundantly displayed. The following suggestive paragraph from the Preface to the second volume, may well be quoted as important for those who undertake the study of Canon Law to bear in mind :

'It should be remembered that the Eastern Church knows nothing of scholasticism, and has never passed through this phase of thought. The West has ; and although, as a system generally taught and received, scholasticism has passed away, yet it has not done so without leaving many a trace behind it. "O God, Whose property is ever to have mercy," is a phrase which to a non-scholastic mind has no meaning. The reduction of matter and form to certain irreducible *minima* are again conceptions which we owe to scholasticism. The doctrine of intention as now taught is another scholastic product. Accordingly, the great Roman Church, which in formulating the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Ever-Virgin Mary has carried the application of logic to spiritual matters further than any other Church has dared to do, finds it necessary first to teach its future theologians the scholastic philosophy, that into minds prepared by that teaching may be poured the Western theology built up on scholasticism. It is suggested that this carrying of the scholastic philosophy, with all that it practically involves, into the sphere of theology may have more to answer for than any other set of facts in estranging the East from the West. As the triumph of logic, scholasticism is no doubt a magnificent system ; but who shall venture to assert that by applying the laws of the human mind in its present state of existence to superphenomenal realities you can obtain a knowledge of eternal truth? Surely, to assert this is to make the human mind the measure of all things, and to reduce God, Who is immeasurable, to the standard of human ideas and human conceptions ! Out of itself the human mind can only elaborate that which, like itself, is human. The true knowledge of God must therefore be a matter of revelation, not of logic. "Touching the Almighty, we cannot find Him out" ¹ (ii. x, xi).

As might be expected, Mr. Reichel's pages have a somewhat mediæval aspect. It could not be otherwise, since the systematic development of Canon Law through the resuscitation of Justinian's jurisprudence and the codifying of the Canons by Gratian belong to the middle of the twelfth century. As Bishop Stubbs tells us : ' John of Salisbury, the philosopher and historian, was, as secretary to Archbishop Theobald, the ancestor of the diocesan chancellors, officials, and vicargenerals, who begin to execute with more regularity and intelligence the law of the Church.'² The after-history, so far

¹ Job xxxviii. 23.

² Bishop Stubbs, *Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History*, p. 301.

as we are here concerned with it, may well be summed up in the words of the same learned prelate, setting forth 'the law administered in the Courts of the Church between the Conquest and the Reformation':

'The laws which guided the English Courts up to the time of the Reformation may then be thus arranged: (1) the Canon Law of Rome, comprising the Decretum of Gratian; the decretals of Gregory IX. published in 1230; the Sext added by Boniface VIII.; the Clementines issued in 1318; and the Extravagants or uncoded edicts of the succeeding Popes. A knowledge of these was the scientific equipment of the ecclesiastical jurist.'¹

We turn aside here for a moment to commend to the attention of those who desire to return to a study long and, as we think, disastrously neglected, the work which we have placed third, at the head of this article. It seems hardly possible that anything of the kind could be produced more carefully prepared, more beautifully printed, and, so far as our own use of it allows us to judge, more accurately exhibited, than these two volumes of the second edition of the Leipzig *Corpus Juris Canonici*. The first volume contains the 'Decretum Magistri Gratiani,' with very complete prolegomena, footnotes, and indices; the second volume contains the Decretals and Extravagants, the sources and authors of which Bishop Stubbs concisely describes in the above extract. Perhaps it may not be superfluous in these days to add the definition of these terms: 'Decretum quod statuit Papa de consilio Cardinalium suorum ad nullius consultationem. . . . Decretalis epistola est quam statuit Papa vel solus, vel cum Cardinalibus ad consultationem alicujus.'² Both are distinguished by Lyndwood from Canon: 'Canon dicitur id quod statuitur in Universali Concilio.'

Such being the basis on which the canonist works, and the accumulation of Decreta and Decretalia having come to an end, so far as he is concerned, in the course of the fifteenth century, the material with which Mr. Reichel deals is mainly mediæval, though of course very much is incorporated from the Canons and constitutions of earlier Councils, both Eastern and Western, and the dicta of ancient Fathers and theologians. The provincial law of the Church of England, contained in the constitutions of the Archbishops of Canterbury from Langton onwards, is comprised in the Provinciale of William Lyndwood. He was official principal of the Archbishop of

¹ *Ecclesiastical Courts Commission*, 1883, Historical Appendix, i. 24.

² Lyndwood, p. 272.

Can
and
cons
subj
worl
John
the l
Doc
A.D.
vinc
thou
and
mora
cedur
Cant
bus l
non
stitut
Natic
of Joh
of An
Lynd
answe
tin of
from
In
of Ca
the ti
Church
state o
the W
of our
illustra
weight
'All
tion to
there be
from th
politan,
trative
primate
council
the land
causes w

Canterbury, ambassador of Henry V. to the court of Spain, and afterwards Bishop of St. Davids, A.D. 1442-6. These constitutions are in the Provinciale digested in order of their subjects and copiously annotated by Lyndwood. With his work is bound up in the Oxford edition the 'Commentary of John Athon' (otherwise called John of Ayton or Acton), on the legatine constitutions of Otho and Othobon; Athon was a Doctor of Civil and Canon Law and Canon of Lincoln: he died A.D. 1381. The provincial constitutions of the Southern Province were adopted by the Convocation of York in A.D. 1463, though with a saving clause which reserved the independence and ancient constitutions of the Northern Province: 'Memorandum quod prælati et clerus in Convocatione 1463 concedunt unanimiter quod effectus constitutionum provincialium Cantuar. Prov. ante hæc tempora tent. et habit. constitutionibus Prov. Ebor. nullo modo repugnant. seu præjudicial., et non aliter nec alio modo, admittantur.'¹ Thus these constitutions may be regarded as having the full authority of the National Church. We need hardly add that the two volumes of John Johnson's *English Canons*, contained in the 'Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology,' include not only a translation of Lyndwood, but go much further back, beginning with the answers or rescripts of Pope Gregory the Great to St. Augustine of Canterbury, and carrying on the record, principally from Sir H. Spelman's *Concilia*, to 1509.

In face of the fact that the contents of a *Complete Manual of Canon Law* 'must necessarily belong so very largely to the times of the papal ascendancy,' it is natural for an English Churchman to inquire how Mr. Reichel deals with the present state of things, when our separation from the Patriarchate of the West is (for the present) complete, though from no fault of our own. We do not know that we could quote any better illustration than Mr. Reichel's concluding statements on the weighty subject of appeals:

'All appeals ought to proceed regularly, i.e. from each jurisdiction to the one next above it, without the omission of any, unless there be a custom to the contrary. Thus an appeal goes regularly from the archdeacon to the bishop, from the bishop to the metropolitan, from the metropolitan to the exarch of the greater administrative district, or primate as he is termed in the West; from the primate to the patriarch, and from the patriarch to an œcumenical council or the Pope. In this country no appeals are by the law of the land to be taken out of the country in mixed or ecclesiastical causes without the leave of the Crown.

¹ Trevor, *The Convocations of the Two Provinces*, p. 84.

'The Act of Supremacy, 26 Henry VIII. c. 1, which substituted the sovereign for the Pope as Supreme Head of the Church in this country, without supplying him with the necessary machinery, practically exempted the bishops of the two English provinces from the supervision of the collective episcopate, which had heretofore, in the intervals between General Councils, been exercised by the Pope, as representative of the whole episcopal body and president of a permanent committee of revision of the whole Church.

'In place of appeals to the Pope, the statute 25 Henry VIII. c. 19, permitted appeals from the archbishop's court to the king in chancery, the practice being for the lord chancellor, on petition, to appoint certain delegates to hear the appeal, who were called the Court of Delegates. If their decision did not give satisfaction, a commission of review might be granted under the great seal, on petition to the king in council, "to revise, review, and rehear the same."

'The Act 2 & 3 William IV. c. 92, having in view the settlement of disputes rather than the conscientious desire of the Church to do justice to all men, prohibited the granting in future of commissions of review, and the Act 3 & 4 William IV. c. 41 transferred the powers and jurisdiction of the Court of Delegates to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. An entirely new lay court was thus established as the supreme court of appeal in matters ecclesiastical in this country, *i.e.* in matters concerning spiritual foundations and the rights and duties of their members, which followed the received principles of the secular courts designed to promote the convenience of the public and promptness of decision, rather than the long-suffering and charitable discipline of the Church, which aims at reproducing upon earth the everlasting justice and mercy of heaven' (ii. 332-34).

This very cursory treatment of so great a subject seems to us either too much or too little. If in a treatise on Canon Law the writer were summarily to dismiss the present English Court of Final Appeal (so-called) as merely a State Court possessing no canonical or spiritual authority, such treatment might not be inconsistent with the character of the work. But if anything like a sketch of the higher Church courts as we have had them since the Reformation were to be given, much more ought to have been said than we find here, and what is said ought to have been much more accurate. It is surely incorrect to say that the Church ever recognized the sovereign as 'substituted for the Pope,' though no doubt King Henry's sycophants hailed him often enough in that style. The title 'Supreme Head' was only recognized by Convocation 'quantum per Christi legem licet,' and by Convocation, too, when sitting under Archbishop Warham, as president; and it was used by the ultra-Romanist Queen

Mary in her early proclamations.¹ Bishop Jewel says with great force in his *Defence of the Apology*, and in answer to Harding :

'Concerning the title of supreme head of the Church we need not to search for Scripture to excuse it. For, first, we devised it not ; secondly, we use it not ; thirdly, our princes at present claim it not. Your fathers, M. Harding, first intituled that most noble and most worthy prince, King Henry VIII., with that unused and strange style, as it may well be thought, in order to bring him into the talk and slander of the world.'²

Surely too, Mr. Reichel, if he went into the subject at all, ought to have noted that the Act 1 Elizabeth c. 1 speaks of the sovereign not as supreme head but only as supreme governor, and also that the meaning of the title was carefully explained in the Royal Injunctions of 1559. We demur also to the account which is given of the Delegates. It is perfunctory, not to say misleading. We shall have occasion hereafter to say something about the Court of Final Appeal, and need only here make one or two brief remarks about the intention of the statute 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19. It is true, as Mr. Reichel observes, that the Acts which did away with appeals to Rome 'did not supply the necessary machinery' for the final determination of causes within the realm, but it is apparent to any impartial person that the recourse to the king in chancery, which was provided, was merely a temporary stop-gap to serve until such machinery could be created. The intention assuredly was that when there had been lack of justice in the Archbishop's court, the Crown should step in as supreme visitor and direct a re-hearing, and that by the spirituality, through a commission created *ad hoc*. And measures were promptly adopted for the supply of the machinery in question. The 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19, A.D. 1533, which embodied the form of the 'submission of the clergy,' provided that the existing canons ecclesiastical then in force should continue in force until further legislation should take place ; and commissioners were appointed to prepare it. We need not follow out into this reign of Henry and that of Edward and Elizabeth the history of the 'Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum.' It is, however, good evidence, passing as it did under the hands and revisions of Archbishops Cranmer and Parker, to show what was the character of the Final Court which the Reformers designed to establish. After providing, in the chapter 'De Appellationibus,' that there should be an appeal from the archbishop 'ad nostram majestatem,' the passage

¹ See Jewel, *Works*, Parker Society, i. 61.

² *Ibid.* iv. 974.

proceeds thus: 'Quo cum fuerit causa devoluta, eam vel concilio provinciali definiri volumus, si gravis sit causa, vel a tribus quatuorve episcopis a nobis ad id constituendis. Quibus rationibus cum res fuerit definita et iudicata, per appellationem amplius cognosci non poterit.'¹ The plain purport of the Acts of Parliament and proceedings in question was, then, not at all to make the king into a Pope, but to secure that all appeals on spiritual matters should be determined within the realm by the spirituality. We have reason indeed to be thankful on many grounds that the 'Reformatio' never received formal State confirmation. The Crown perhaps preferred to leave the ecclesiastical law in an indefinite form, rather than to find itself bound over to enforce a large body of canons by according to them plain and full authority; but the scheme, which was complete or nearly so, as it came from the hands of the Royal Commissioners, remains a very valuable proof of what their plans were and the principles on which the English Reformers proposed to settle the vexed questions about appeals.

It must be granted that the nature of Mr. Reichel's work justifies him in passing over *sicco pede* many things in the present condition of the Church of England which are not to be found in any way recognised in the Canon Law of which he is treating. In our isolation usages of various kinds have grown up, by mere custom, or by statute law tacitly accepted, under shelter of the Royal Supremacy, of which Supremacy very exaggerated ideas were held for some generations after the breach with Rome—ideas which are, perhaps, in some particulars peculiar to ourselves. They may be vindicated, in some instances at any rate, as a legitimate exercise of the liberty which we claim for a National Church, but need not be discussed or described in a 'Complete Manual of Canon Law.' We do, however, note some particulars on which Mr. Reichel might have been expected to refer to Anglican authorities. It is curious, *e.g.*, to note that in treating of the marriage of the clergy he does not refer to the Articles of Religion, which assuredly have canonical authority. And we must observe also that from an Anglican point of view the discussion as regards the relation of the episcopate to the presbyterate is unsatisfactory. 'Two views on this subject are current,' Mr. Reichel tells us (i. 283-84):

¹ *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, Oxford, 1850, p. 302. It is worth while to draw attention, as Mr. Collins also does, to an admirable analysis and appreciation of the *Reformatio* contained in Canon Dixon's *History of the Church of England*, iii. 366 sqq.

gift
presb
had
ever,
was
and
restra
bisho
autho
the e
which
to up
chara
reside
presb
'
the g
(1) th
them
Testa
those
of eac
of ord
comm
superv
of the
their l
bers o
deacon
of the
includ
guardi
appear
presby
supervi
immed

In
to the
from t
We m
weight
whatev
uncom
have b
Priests
tive de
earlier

'According to one, the full power of order, *i.e.* the spiritual gift necessary for the government of the Church, resides in the presbyterate equally with the episcopate, and presbyters collectively had succeeded to the place of the apostolic college. Since, however, according to Roman law, the act of any member of a college was deemed as authoritative as the act of all, to prevent lawlessness and confusion, the power of order was generally placed under restraint and concentrated for exercise in certain chief presbyters or bishops, who are now alone regarded as having succeeded to the full authority of Apostles to represent Christ. According to this view, the episcopate is an accession of authority and a position of honour, which has been introduced into the Church by Divine appointment to uphold unity, but not an order having a distinct sacramental character. The other view considers that the full power of order resides only in the episcopate, from which it must follow that the presbyterate is an imperfect sacramental order.'

'The historical evidence seems to show that in Apostolic times the government of the Church was committed to two sets of officers (1) those who had a universal commission, consisting of the Apostles themselves and other apostolic men, variously called in the New Testament apostles, prophets, teachers, and evangelists; and (2) those who had only a local commission, the presbyters and deacons of each city. To both of these classes was committed the full power of order necessary for the government of the Church, yet so that being committed to them collectively the local officers were subject to the supervision of those holding the universal commission. On the death of the Apostles and other primary holders of the universal commission, their lower duties appear to have been discharged by the various members of the local colleges; the presbyters becoming local teachers, the deacons local evangelists, and readers succeeding to the lower duties of the prophet's office. The higher duties of the prophet's office, including the general supervision of all the churches and the guardianship of their external as opposed to their internal relations, appear to have been placed under the charge of a few leading presbyters, such as Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, each of whom supervised those parts of the Church with which he was more immediately brought into contact' (i. 285-87).

In a word, Mr. Reichel's statements point very distinctly to the conclusion that the episcopate is not an order distinct from the presbyterate, though he does not plainly so assert. We must avow our opinion that the whole treatment of this weighty subject is most one-sided and imperfect. No notice whatever is taken of the Anglican Ordinal with its clear uncompromising assertion that 'from the Apostles' time there have been these three Orders in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons;' nor of the very learned and exhaustive defence of this position by Bishop Lightfoot, not to name earlier authorities. It seems to us that Mr. Reichel has

allowed himself as regards this question to be unduly influenced by the schoolmen and the canonists, who sought to extol the order of priesthood, in view of their developments of Eucharistic doctrine, and to depress unduly the episcopal order, as if bishops held their powers merely as delegates of the Pope. It would take us too far away from our present purpose were we to discuss this argument at length. It has been well and recently dealt with by others; and our immediate business is rather to describe the character and tone of Mr. Reichel's volumes.

A very interesting and important question arises upon a survey of the vast and multifarious contents of the Canon Law as here exhibited. How far historically has it been recognized as authoritative by the Church of England? How far is it to be deemed of present obligation?

To these questions an almost unanimous and very definite answer has been given by English ecclesiastical lawyers. The fourth chapter of Phillimore's part i., to go no further, lays it down positively enough that the law by which the Church Courts of England have been governed from the earliest times is

'not the general Canon Law of Europe, imported as a body of law into this kingdom, and governing those Courts *proprio vigore*, but instead thereof an ecclesiastical law of which the general Canon Law is no doubt the basis, but which has been modified and altered from time to time by the ecclesiastical constitutions of our archbishops and bishops, and by the legislature of the realm, and which has been known from early times as the King's Ecclesiastical Law. . . . But that the Canon Law of Europe does not, and never did as a body of laws, form part of the law of England has long been settled and established law' (i. 16).

The words are those of Lord Chief-Justice Tindal in the famous case *Reg. v. Millis*, and the statements are in Phillimore fortified by quotations from other weighty authorities. Those who would estimate them properly may be referred to Bishop Stubbs's *Constitutional History*, iii. 321-23, and to his 'Historical Appendix' to the Report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, i. 24, 25. It might, indeed, have been assumed as an axiom that our Courts in England are only so far concerned with the *Corpus Juris Canonici* as we have in fact adopted it for our own. A knowledge of the *Decretum* and its supplements undoubtedly furnished the equipment for the ecclesiastical lawyer, but the texts we have always understood to be not in themselves authoritative. However, this position has now been challenged, and that,

too, by
bridge,
Review
very le
the *di*
three p
the nu
vincial
He cor
the Eco
Canon
dience,
and al
from it
master
who an
we can
discrep
the one
by Eng
in real
be dou
already
the De
during
the wo
Courts
to find
court a
judge o
State v
enough
referen
person
State i
in some
that th
tions, c
did not
It may
Mr. Co
all, tha
put it:
'All
tained in

too, by redoubtable opponents. Professor Maitland, of Cambridge, has recently contributed to the *English Historical Review* three papers on the 'Canon Law in England,' and very learned and careful papers they are, in which he discusses the *dicta* in question and utterly disputes them. Of the three papers the most important and interesting is the one in the number for July 1896, in which he examines the *Provinciale* of Lyndwood with this particular question in view. He concludes, without much hesitation or qualification, that the Ecclesiastical Courts before the Reformation regarded the Canon Law of Rome not only with respect but with obedience, as absolutely binding. The papers of Dr. Maitland and also, and not less, the essay of Mr. Collins, necessarily from its design and purpose a mere sketch, but in its way masterly, may be heartily commended to the attention of all who are interested in this study. Into so large a question we cannot enter here, but may venture to remark that the discrepancy between Dr. Maitland and Professor Collins on the one side, and the theory generally, if not universally, held by English lawyers of all schools on the other side, may not in reality be so great as at first sight it seems. It cannot be doubted that very large portions of the Decretum had already become antiquated in the thirteenth century, and that the Decretals which issued in copious flow from the Popes during that and the early years of the next century formed the working maxims on which the judges in the Church Courts usually proceeded. We should not the least expect to find an Official Principal of those days openly rejecting in court any of them, and least of all perhaps an ecclesiastical judge of the time of the Lancastrian kings, when Church and State were working in thorough harmony. But it is clear enough that many of these papal deliverances had no sort of reference to England, but were temporary or local or even personal in their relevancy; that others were set aside by State interference in the way of enactment or prohibition, or in some cases by extra-legal force or intimidation; and also that the English archbishops, in their Provincial Constitutions, occasionally took liberties with them as though they did not regard them as strictly and literally binding among us. It may, then, possibly be the case that Dr. Maitland and Mr. Collins are right in their main contention, and yet, after all, that the question remains substantially as Blackstone has put it:

'All the strength that either the papal or imperial laws have obtained in this realm, or indeed in any other kingdom in Europe, is only

because they have been admitted and received by immemorial usage and custom in some particular cases and some particular courts, . . . or else because they are some other cases introduced by consent of Parliament.¹

Bishop Stubbs, who quotes this passage,² adds by way of example, 'Edward I., in the statute *De Bigamis*, recognizes and extends the application of a constitution of the General Council of Lyons.' It may be worth while in this place to extract some valuable remarks of Mr. Collins on the operation of desuetude and non-user on Church law :

'But turning from the *Decretum* to the ecclesiastical jurists at large, there is no question whatever that the principle is fully recognized that contrary custom abrogates law ; not, indeed, as applying to natural law or the moral law, but as applying to those particular applications, of which I have formerly spoken, of the Christian law to particular circumstances—positive enactments, in fact. And if we ask how long the prevalence of the contrary custom is to be, perhaps the answer will surprise us. The great canonist Nicholas de Tudeschis, commonly known as Cardinal Panormitan, answers that ten years is sufficient if it does not directly run counter to the written law, and forty if it does. "Either custom is *beside* canon law, and then ten years suffice. Or else it is *against* canon law, and then a period of forty years is necessary." And moreover, if the custom has become established for a period of forty years, it cannot be abolished by a single act in a contrary direction. For it has now become law. And the former law can only be restored by the consent of the community at large, or by the same authority by which it was originally introduced. This would appear to be the doctrine of canonists at large upon the subject ; and, in particular, the period of forty years' desuetude seems to be that which is generally accepted. I do not find any who mention any other period. So little room did the theory of the canonists leave for unauthorized restoration by private persons of what they believe to be the law.

'Naturally enough this principle needed to be guarded in various ways. The desuetude must not be the result of simple ignorance or error. It must be conscious. There must be a deliberate intention to abrogate the law ; for a custom arising out of ignorance could not be said to express the mind of the Church. But not only was the principle guarded, it was also gradually bound down. Such a principle was obviously at variance with the whole mediæval system in its practical working ; and consequently there has been a continual tendency to restrict its application in every possible way, and this tendency is more and more marked as we come down to modern

¹ Blackstone's *Commentaries*, i. 79, 80.

² *Constitutional History*, iii. 323 note. The Second Council of Lyons (A.D. 1274) is meant, the Fourteenth General Council according to Roman computation.

days. It must be with the consent of the superior, whoever he may be ; for, according to the mediæval view which is still largely held among papists, the force of ecclesiastical law comes from the legislator rather than from the society at large.'

Of course since the Reformation the question is greatly narrowed for us. The interdiction of appeals to Rome by the Act of 24 Henry VIII. cap. 12 at once cut away for all practical purposes very large portions of the Roman Canon Law ; and the Act for the Submission of the Clergy in the year following, which in its last clause enacts that such 'canons, constitutions, ordinances, and synodals provincial already made and not contrariant to the laws, statutes, and customs of the realm, nor to the damage and hurt of the king's prerogative royal, shall be used and executed' until reviewed ; imposed further limitations and qualifications, and this review has not in fact yet taken place. It is quite possible that some day strange and unexpected results may follow from the indeterminate condition in which the Canon Law was thus left. The remarkable case of *Burder v. Mavor* (1848), which is thrice referred to in Phillimore, is a striking illustration. The defendant had been in possession of the incumbency of Forest Hill, near Oxford, since 1823. In 1848 he was presented to the rectory of Hadleigh in Essex. He was exempted from the provisions of the Pluralities Act 1 & 2 Vict. c. 106, which of course did not apply to those already beneficed, and so he claimed to hold Forest Hill still. He was, however, ousted therefrom by sentence of the Court of Arches, which declared that incumbency void upon Mr. Mavor's institution to another, by virtue of a canon of the Fourth Council of Lateran, held A.D. 1215 under Innocent III.—the Council, by the by, in which the dogma of transubstantiation was formulated—and contained in the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX., bk. 3, tit. 5, c. 28. It may be noted, however, that this particular canon was certainly well known and recognized in England, for Archbishop Peckham in 1279 took upon him to temper its severities. The case is in many ways instructive. It suggests, *inter alia*, that if our rulers had possessed any acquaintance with Canon Law they might have found among its multitudinous provisions as regards discipline some materials more effective and more authoritative than our modern enactments have proved themselves to be. Not, indeed, that the condemnation of pluralities in 1215, which was repeated on subsequent occasions, was found very effective. The scandal continued, and, indeed, was if

anything aggravated down to the time of the Reformation. Wolsey, *e.g.*, was an egregious pluralist.

When surveying the almost infinite number of decisions of so many kinds made by Church authority in past ages, we are reminded of the decay of discipline among ourselves, and of the scandalous decrepitude into which our ecclesiastical judicature has fallen. Discipline as regards the laity is almost a dead letter, not only indeed in England, but in the Western Church generally, except such private discipline as may be administered through the Confessional. The last occasion when a public and official sentence for immorality was pronounced on a layman in England was in 1856, and by Sir R. Phillimore, as Chancellor of Chichester;¹ and we may justly doubt whether in these days the punishment of laymen *pro salute animæ* could with advantage be revived. But we ought at any rate to recover the means of excluding from membership in the Church those who set at naught the terms of their communion with her. And as a means thereto a thorough reconstitution and reinvigoration of our Ecclesiastical Courts seems necessary; it would be contrary to all reason, justice, and precedent to leave such matters to the individual priest. The ancient Court of Arches did much in old days to develop sound principles of jurisprudence in its department, and especially to safeguard the law of Christian marriage. That court is now almost dormant, wakening up now and then spasmodically when something urgent has to be done, as it did a few weeks ago for one solitary decision. What would be done in case a grave question of ritual or doctrine had to be brought into litigation it is difficult to imagine. The Act of 1874, which was framed expressly to deal with the former class of cases, is practically defunct. Far from working smoothly and effectually as was predicted, it has been found to abound in complications and uncertainties, and above all the spiritual authority of the court which it sets up will not be acknowledged. The Act of 1840, as has been often observed, was never intended to deal with cases of doctrine or ritual; no one seems at that time to have expected that such cases would occur; the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Church was apparently regarded as settled, and only needing to be enforced; and the purely parliamentary origin of the court would be now regarded as tainting the canonical obligation of any decisions reached through its machinery.² Then there is no canonical Court of Appeal. Lord

¹ Phillimore, ii. 1070, 1071.

² It is very instructive to read the Preface to Dr. Cardwell's *Synodalia*

Per
can
Col
inst
on
aut
Fir
ani
nor
mos
and
thro
dio
aris
nea
disp
to
seri
give
siste
been
lum
any

(Oxf
point
in ill
when
says
doon
it ma
actual
have
witho
reme
the s
well
natur
assur
assur
short

1
cath
duct
Consi
denie
ever,
there
for an
some

Penzance stands merely upon statute ; and has never qualified canonically to act as Dean of the Arches. The so-called Final Court is essentially civil and lay ; it is an Act of Parliament institution and nothing more ; the episcopal assessors, added on by an afterthought, lend it merely a semblance of spiritual authority which it does not in fact possess. The Courts of First Instance are for the most part in a state of suspended animation. Two or three of the diocesan chancellors in the northern province do indeed sit regularly and publicly. But most of the chancellors are barristers practising in London, and what diocesan business they transact is ordinarily got through privately in chambers ; they are never seen in their dioceses if they can help it, and no wonder, for their income arises almost entirely from marriage licences, and comes in nearly automatically. To journey to and fro in order to dispose of diocesan business which could yield at best nothing to compensate for missing London fees, would involve a serious sacrifice ; and in consequence no encouragement is given to activity in the diocesan courts. The ancient Consistory Courts are too often empty and forlorn ; they have been shut up for years ; they have in some cases become mere lumber rooms, into which the cathedral vergers thrust away anything that needs to be got rid of.¹ Moreover, the chan-

(Oxford, 1842), and to note how far we have advanced from the standpoint of Churchmen sixty years ago. A few sentences may be quoted in illustration. After describing the prorogation of Convocation in 1717, when the Crown interposed to protect Bishop Hoadly, Dr. Cardwell says (p. xviii) : 'From that day Convocation appears to have been doomed to a perpetual silence.' Further on (p. xxiv) he adds : 'Though it may be granted that synods from their constitution are ill suited to the actual condition of the Church, and from past experience of their conduct have been condemned to a perpetual silence, the Church is not left without its outward and effectual forms of government. Let it be remembered that the articles of religion, the liturgy, and the homilies, the standards of the national faith, have all been approved by synods as well as parliaments ; and though they are not unchangeable in their nature, being ordained only by man's authority, still it is unreasonable to assume that they are in want of correction, and unwise on a mere assumption to create facilities for correcting them. Such authority, in short, as is at present requisite is rather executive than legislative.'

¹ The writer well remembers a lively account of a visit to one of our cathedrals given to him by a friend some years ago. Having been conducted round by one of the vergers, the visitor asked at length for the Consistory Court. The verger did not know what was meant, and indeed denied that there was any such place in the cathedral. The other, however, happened to be a diocesan chancellor, and insisted that such a place there needs must be. After some altercation a retired verger was sent for and questioned, and did at length remember that there used to be some sittings of a court in the cathedral, and showed where they took

cellorships with few exceptions are now of trifling value ; they are mostly held in plurality (Dr. Tristram has, perhaps, half a dozen of them), and none of them can yield what would be reckoned adequate salary for a learned and experienced lawyer. The disastrous legislation of 1857, for which there was no public demand whatever, and which has conferred on the public no benefit whatever, dissolved Doctors' Commons, destroyed at the same time the study of Church law as a distinct branch of jurisprudence, took away its emoluments, and deprived the Church of that valuable class of lawyers called civilians. The Clergy Discipline Act of 1892 is not regarded by Sir W. Phillimore with at all a favourable eye (see pt. iv. chaps. viii. and x.). He thinks it unwise to have passed a new Act of this nature after so much toil and money had been spent in interpreting the Act of 1840 and making it workable. And we are not prepared to say that well-founded objections may not be urged against some of the provisions of the new Act. If, however, it prove to be, as seems not unlikely, effective in its working and not too costly, Churchmen will be content with it. It is not necessary to be so very scrupulous as to the correctness in theory of the methods employed in dealing with 'criminous clerks.' But it is essentially different when questions connected with Divine worship and sacred truth are mooted ; and we certainly seem to have progressed thus far that no courts not unequivocally spiritual in their origin and ecclesiastical in their constitution will now be accepted as competent in such cases. The 'Reformation Settlement' does, however, clearly indicate the proper lines on which a Court of Final Appeal ought to be constructed. We may reasonably hope that the next Dean of the Arches will be canonically qualified for his high functions. And as regards the Courts of First Instance we may offer the suggestion that their tribunals should once more be generally occupied by duly qualified men in orders. The study of the Canon Law ought to be revived and encouraged.¹ Cambridge has already a professor admirably qualified to lecture on the subject, as has also King's College, London ; and the other universities ought each to have its reader in Church Law. Surely it would be practicable also to institute examinations and degrees in this study ; and, indeed, there is, so far as we know, no reason why the Archbishop of Canterbury

place. It was found to be now a receptacle for coals, brooms, broken articles, &c., &c. And this is not a solitary instance!

¹ See some valuable remarks by Chancellor Dibdin at the Derby Church Congress of 1882. *Report*, pp. 129-33.

should not at any time confer the degree of bachelor and doctor in this faculty, nor why he should not again use his power of granting his fiat to those who could practise in the Arches Court; nor why the Bishops should not limit themselves in selecting chancellors to those qualified thus. In fact it seems evident that by Church authority alone, without any interposition of Parliament, not a little might be done to reconstruct and re-invigorate at any rate the primary and the intermediate courts. We might thus obtain a race of chancellors who would actively and in person discharge their duties; who could dispose speedily and effectually of many matters now necessarily devolved on commissions *ad hoc*; and be, what the holder of this office was intended to be, not merely a legal official exercising jurisdiction in court on occasion, but also a bishop's vicar-general, in fact and not in name only—one who would relieve the bishop from the more secular business incidental to diocesan affairs, and leave him at leisure for his more sacred functions.¹

Mr. Collins's wisely stated recommendation of the study of the Canon Law may serve as a not inappropriate conclusion of this paper:

'In what sense is it true that the canons derive their authority from the Church of to-day? Some there are, no doubt, which are common to the whole Church; but others are common to us and the East, or to us and the Roman communion, or peculiar to ourselves. The answer clearly is that the Church is, so to speak, in every part of the Church; and that what is done by the English Church at the present day for her own members has, for them, the authority of the whole Church. For us, then, the authoritative canon law is not something in the clouds, or in the Roman Church, or in certain mediæval law books, or anywhere else; it is that which is enforced, observed, and kept by those who best represent the mind of our own Church. If it be said that this is vague, it need only be answered that the same thing is true of the canon law of any other body, and not least so in that body whose canon law looks most precise on paper. And further, it will become less vague in proportion as we realize more of the spirit of discipline, and learn to understand better the canonical principles of the Church.

'For if, on the other hand, it be simply claimed that the canons of other days are eminently deserving of study, nothing could possibly be more true. The mind of the Church can only be a very ill-informed mind so long as it is content to walk blindly by the canon law which it holds by tradition, with its ever-growing accretions and ossifications, and resolutely turns away from the study of other days. It is hard to see how such a system can end in anything

¹ What, *e.g.*, can be more absurd than to make the bishop judge in a dispute about dilapidations? Yet this is the provision of the Act of 1871.

but the loss of true Catholic principles if it be carried far enough. And, on the other hand, the Church which is content to deal with cases as they arise by a rough "rule of thumb," and to disregard the study of the principles and the practice of the past, is in danger of still greater disaster. If some parts of Christendom seem to have incurred the former danger, we have not been free from the latter. We have lost immeasurably by the neglect of this study, and have nothing to lose, but everything to gain, by a fuller absorption of the canonical spirit of the Church. But if the result be to bring home to the minds of the Bishops, or of the Church at large, that the revival or the fuller observance of such and such principles or precepts is desirable, we must not forget that they will come into operation not because they were once in force in days gone by, but because they commend themselves to the mind of the Church of to-day, and are made valid by her authority and sanction.'

* * * As a new edition of Sir W. Phillimore's work is sure to be called for eventually, it is worth while to call attention to a few errors and omissions which we have noted.

P. 261, note (c). 'Cf. *Canones Concilii Bracara*.' There were four Councils of Bracara. Which is intended? And for Bracara read Bracaræ.

P. 73, note (t). The reference to Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.*, is wrong. It should stand ii. 301.

P. 77, note (i). The reference to Lyndwood cannot be verified. Lyndwood is sometimes called Lindwood in these volumes.

P. 106 (p). The reference to Gibson cannot be verified.

P. xxxi. 'The Extravagants of Pope Joan the Twenty Second' should be corrected. Pope John of course is meant.

P. 755. 'Caudry's case.' This name is usually written Cawdry, and sometimes is so in these volumes.

P. 16. For 'Twenty-fourth Council of Lateran' read Fourth Council. The reference to Burder v. Mavor in xxxvii as to be found on p. 386 should stand 398.

P. 21. The reference to Van Espen, note (o), is 'non ad rem.' What is wanted will be found in an earlier paragraph.

P. 22. For Ariminum read Ariminum.

When St. Augustine's works are referred to the edition used should be stated.

P. 855. 'Cœlestus II.' *Quere* Cœlestin?

P. 993, note (l). *Negit quis*, read *negat*.

P. 1074, note (x). There is an error in the punctuation.

P. 1284. For 'capitulary' read capitularly, as in next page.

ART. XI.—CANON OVERTON ON THE
CHURCH IN ENGLAND.

The Church in England. By JOHN HENRY OVERTON, D.D., Rector of Epworth and Canon of Lincoln. In two volumes. Being Volumes IX. and X. of *The National Churches*, edited by the Rev. P. H. DITCHFIELD, M.A., F.R.Hist.S. With Maps. (London, 1897.)

BY the death of Archdeacon Perry and the departure of Canon Overton into Leicestershire two great sources of historical strength have been removed from the active work of the Church in the diocese of Lincoln. That diocese may reflect with satisfaction that Canon Overton has gone to a living which, if no longer in its area, is in the gift of the Dean and Chapter of Lincoln, and that he still remains a beneficed priest in the diocese as Prebendary of Stow Longa. But it must regret that the patronage in the hands of the Bishop is so insufficient that he cannot keep some of his best ecclesiastical administrators, historians, and men of great spiritual power, round about him as he would. Mr. Ditchfield's series, containing Canon Meyrick's *Spain*, Canon Pennington's *Italy*, and these two excellent volumes by Canon Overton, shows that the Chapter of Lincoln, of which Bishop Wordsworth called Perry the historiographer, is still strong in history. With a hearty respect for the writings and labours of both men, we may assist our readers to appreciate their work, and specially the new work now before us, by comparing the styles of Archdeacon Perry and Canon Overton. In the books of both the character of the men is clearly reflected. In the case of Perry we have, alas! the advantage of obituary notices to guide us in arriving at the impression which the man and his literary work produced. Sub-Dean Clements of Lincoln, in a very touching and thorough memorial sermon, based upon a knowledge of more than half a century, has spoken of Perry's habitual reality, marked independence of judgment, striking accuracy of statement, sober-mindedness, and clear common sense, which made him 'a loyal and devoted Churchman of the best Anglican type.'¹ The Venerable John Bond, Perry's successor in the Archdeaconry of Stow, described his predecessor as 'an accurate scholar, a well-read Divine, a humble, diligent, truth-seeking, truth-

¹ *Lincoln Diocesan Magazine* for 1897, pp. 53-4.

loving man, as simple and straightforward as he was learned and judicious,' who

'not only ever lived and spake as a loyal and devout Churchman himself, but in his careful and pregnant writings . . . has shown to others the solid ground upon which we stand in the old paths, and why with confidence and hope we may live and work and die in the Church of England, as a true and living branch of the One Holy Catholic Church.'¹

We do not know that any deductions need be made from these warm encomiums in regard to the positive value of Perry's historical productions, but our own feeling with regard to his literary work, and also to the learned papers which we have heard him read on such subjects as ecclesiastical history and modern Biblical criticism, has always been that it was thoroughly solid and sound, but peculiarly unrelieved by lighter touches, in fact, that it was too dry, even dull and heavy. It is not uncommon, as all tutors in ecclesiastical history will bear us out in saying, to hear pupils, even those who are hard reading men, confess that they are bored by the weight of Perry's solid matter. Even in *The Life of St. Hugh*² where the materials for humour are abundant and unavoidable, it must be confessed that the humour is very dry and the smiles are grim, though the writer plainly enjoys his pleasant task. But we can think of half a dozen historical writers who would have produced a charming *Life of St. Hugh*. What an account of him would have been given by Mr. Plummer, or Dr. Bright, or Mrs. Oliphant, or the Bishop of Bristol—whose gifts of popular writing make him the Sir Robert Ball of ecclesiastical history—or Canon Overton himself! For in Canon Overton's writings we find the same solidity, accuracy, and loyalty to the Anglican position for which Perry was justly esteemed, and at the same time a lively and even racy style, with touches of humour at every turn. The new broom of our youngest contemporary, *Literature*, sweeps so very clean that we must beware of superlative criticism, which we are told is an error of lenient reviewers in these days. But we are not afraid to say that in these two volumes on *The Church in England* Canon

¹ *The Charge* of the Ven. J. Bond, M.A., at his first Visitation of the Archdeaconry of Stow (Keyworth: Lincoln, 1897), p. 4.

² *The Life of St. Hugh of Avalon*, Bishop of Lincoln. With some account of his predecessors in the See of Lincoln. (London, 1879.) Compare the *Church Quarterly Review*, No. 17, and see '*Vie de Saint Hugues Chartreux, Evêque de Lincoln* (1140-1200). Par un religieux de La Grande Chartreuse.' (Montreuil, 1890.)

Over
wh
sam
at w
lived
writ
Wes
that
Ang
meth
write
hum
scrib
he is
again
this v
the g
credi
eithe
they
preter
as if
that h
doctri
Review
his na
of hist
Th
'strive
has be
they dw
which
ecclesi
not "C
clusion
As the
quite c
to tou
Englan
her, w
volume
Can
of the
pact, an
use of s
VOL.

Overton has collected a fund of instruction and enjoyment which will bear comparison with any other works upon the same topic. We believe also that another influence has been at work in the writing of this history. Canon Overton has lived at Epworth, Wesley's birthplace, and has, we suppose, written these pages in the very rectory house in which John Wesley was born. He is not without a joyous consciousness that the strong buoyant love for truth which inspires this Anglican History would have commended itself, alike in its method and in its achieved results, to Wesley himself, and he writes, not only out of a full mind and a ready sense of humour, but with a sort of triumphant assurance that in describing facts as they are and in telling an unvarnished tale he is producing a forcible apology for the Church of England, against Rome indeed, but also against Dissent. In saying this we might convey a false impression unless we alluded to the generous impartiality of the author, who is ready to give credit to all the good points of those who differ from him, either on fundamental matters, or merely in the way in which they look at the facts recorded. Canon Overton makes no pretence of hiding his enthusiasm for the Church of England as if he were ashamed of it. Nor does he conceal in any way that he stands in the same position with regard to evangelical doctrine and apostolical orders as the *Church Quarterly Review*. But he is particularly fair and candid in all parts of his narrative, and in his Preface he shows at once what sort of history his readers may expect from his pen.

These volumes

'strive to bring out prominently how, from the very first, the Church has been inextricably interwoven with the life of the nation; and they dwell upon the action of kings and statesmen, and upon matters which are in one sense secular matters more fully than purely ecclesiastical histories are wont to do. . . . Their primary object is, not "Church Defence," but simply to state facts, to whatever conclusion those facts may lead' (Pref. pp. v, vi).

As the volumes form two of a series, although of course quite complete in themselves, it has been thought sufficient to touch very lightly upon the relation of the Church of England to other parts of the Church in communion with her, whose history has appeared, or will appear, in other volumes of the series.

Canon Overton works steadily through the whole period of the life of the Church in England. The narrative is compact, and, so far as we can see, there has been an economical use of space throughout the work. The first volume consists

of 484 pages, and covers the ground from the earliest records of Christianity in Britain to the close of the Tudor period. A very fair idea of the mode of treatment, so far as space is concerned, may be gathered from the fact that, speaking roughly, about 100 pages are allotted to the history down to the death of Bede. Of the three chapters—the type is defective in the word ‘chapter’ on p. vii.¹—which comprise this part of the work, the first is devoted to ‘the British Church,’ and the remaining two describe ‘the early English Church’ before and after the Council of Whitby. The remaining part of the volume is divided into twelve chapters, in one of which (p. 320) we slightly regret that Canon Overton has not followed Mr. Gladstone’s example and written ‘Renaissance’ for ‘Renaissance.’² In the two chapters on the early English Church from the death of Bede to the Norman Conquest, the death of Alfred is the event which naturally marks the division of the period, and there are five chapters on the Mediæval Church from the Norman Conquest to the accession of Henry VII. Then, after the chapter on the Renaissance, follow four chapters on the Tudor period. The map which forms the frontispiece of this volume shows the English and Welsh dioceses towards the close of the eighth century, and the chief places mentioned in this volume in connexion with the British and early English Churches. It will be noticed that this map delineates the state of affairs about a century later than Dr. Bright’s new map, which we recently criticized,³ and coincides with Map X. in the new *Historical Church Atlas* of the S.P.C.K. We have very carefully compared these three maps. For the kingdoms in about A.D. 700 Dr. Bright’s is the best; the dioceses, bearing in mind the later date, are more clearly defined by Canon Overton; while the S.P.C.K. atlas marks a much larger number of places than either of the other two maps. Canon Overton has somewhat sacrificed the insertion of names to a desire for clearness. For example, Boston, Crowland, and Felixstowe are not marked. Catterick in the dales is marked, but ‘dales’ is misprinted and the place is not included in the index. Nor is the Swale in the index (i. 39), for, as our author observes, ‘names only casually mentioned have not been included’ in what will be

¹ A short list of corrigenda is given in vol. i. p. ix, but there are other slips in vol. i. p. 367 note, vol. ii. pp. 101 note, 364, and we regret that the name of a venerable survivor of the early Tractarian tale-writers, the Rev. W. E. Heygate, is omitted in vol. ii. p. 347.

² *The Romanes Lecture*, p. 22, n. 26 (Oxford, 1892).

³ *Chapters of Early English Church History*, third edition (Oxford, 1897), frontispiece; see *Church Quarterly Review*, No. 89, pp. 13-14.

four
wor
wh
tak
aut
Ove
‘Th
whi
anc
Eng
Chu
be r
tre
doul
say,
main
the
mati
have
the
dista
refer
passa
of co
shoul
result
made
are f
Over
and
words
‘T
which
once
been
laying
British
piety
than
hauteu
prepon
man th
That
area
ment,

found on main points to be a usefully compiled guide to the work (ii. 440). A sensible view, entirely free from pedantry, which will commend itself to the vast majority of readers, is taken of the spelling of proper names, and we have the best authority for saying that this is the matter to which Canon Overton alludes in the words of his Preface when he says: 'The Bishop of Oxford [Dr. Stubbs] has given his opinion—which to my mind is final—on a matter of essential importance connected with the whole of the history of the early English Church' (Pref. p. vi). There are certain epochs of Church History in which Canon Overton's volumes might be naturally expected to be specially strong, but although the treatment of the eighteenth and the present centuries is undoubtedly one of the finest parts of the work, we are able to say, and it is no small praise, that the level of that part is well maintained in the rest of the book, even if in certain parts the author has depended upon secondary sources of information. It is a piece of smooth and even work, and we have been surprised, as we have examined the chapters on the various periods, that Canon Overton, at a considerable distance from any great public library, has been able to refer his readers in almost every instance to the really crucial passages upon the matter which he had in hand. It will not, of course, be possible to comment on as many topics as we should desire to notice, nor can we mention nearly all the results of our examination. Selections must perforce be made, and we can only endeavour to see that our extracts are fair samples of the whole. In the first volume Canon Overton sums up his view of the true position of Gregory and Augustine in the life of English Christianity in these words:

'To these two men the English Church owes a debt of gratitude which she ought never to forget. The exaggerated estimate which was once taken of the actual work done by them has, not unnaturally, been followed by a reaction. But to Gregory belongs the credit of laying the foundation of the English, as distinguished from the British, Church, and his wisdom was no less conspicuous than his piety in the undertaking. Augustine was of a more mixed character than Gregory; but if on some occasions he showed timidity, on others hauteur, on others lack of judgment and tact, yet the good largely preponderated over the bad. He was the faithful servant of a greater man than himself, and in that capacity did good service' (i. 30-1).

That does not go very deeply into the question over what area the 'good service' extended, but it is a very fair statement, and as we have in our previous number elaborated the

point, we will not now further dwell upon it. A passing allusion must be made to the excellent summary of Theodore's great work, under four heads (i. 75-6). We will pass by, too, the bright days of scholarship in which Bede and Alcuin lived, and also, though with reluctance, the times of Alfred, when 'the true deliverer of the Church and nation, not only from the Danes, but also from the degeneracy into which both had fallen, was not, in name at least, a saint, nor indeed a martyr, but a most pious and able king' (i. 120). Our only reason for not lingering over other great names in the time before the Conquest—Dunstan, of whom an impartial if not quite sufficiently searching estimate is given (pp. 135-6), Elfric the grammarian (p. 139), and St. Alphege (pp. 140-2)—is that we must find room for a summary of Canon Overton's survey of the whole Pre-Norman period (pp. 149-55). The Church was then really National, a most valuable link between all grades of society, the sole conductor of education, and thoroughly patriotic. There was an insularity perhaps about it, and pagan ways long survived¹ the introduction of the Gospel; but the Church of England before the Conquest was in its childhood, and consequently attractive.

The history of the Church from the Norman Conquest to the accession of Henry VII. is too little known to general readers, and is not frequently set as a special period in history examinations. But it is a period which deserves both the labour of special study and the attention of the general reader, and Canon Overton's five chapters on the Mediæval Church provide materials for both. If we are to understand the effects of the Norman Conquest upon the Church of England we must bear in mind that the foreign conqueror was most careful not to pose in that capacity, and that a halo of religion was cast over the whole work (p. 157). The English Church was brought into closer conformity with Rome, monasticism was extended, learning was encouraged and advanced (pp. 163-4), church-building was undertaken on a magnificent scale (p. 169). After judicious passages upon Anselm (pp. 183-4) and Becket (pp. 210-11), both of whom did so much to advance the Roman usurpation, we come to the great turning-point of the year 1213 when John did homage to Innocent, and made Englishmen feel that they could stand no more. Here at last there is a pause in the growing power of Rome: 'We make a break in the middle

¹ This is a very fruitful topic, and there are innumerable illustrations of it in English history. See Dr. Bright's *Early English Church History*, pp. 78-82, 120, 426, 428, 436.

of a
pap
mar
the
elev

he w
Bish
stea
secu
reje
failu
Man
and
does
320-

This
'cas
clud
a ve
'the
fortu
and
grou
glad
secon
volu
whic
upon
(pp.
virat
(pp.
the l
natur
intric
tions

T
show

1
2
3

beth
Stu
this in
text of
beth s

of a reign, in the middle of a primacy, in the middle of a papacy, but at the end of a policy' (p. 224). We must summarize the contents of the next three chapters by quoting the passage with which Canon Overton cleverly opens his eleventh chapter :

"If any man will look down along the line of early English history, he will see a standing contest between the rulers of the land and the Bishop of Rome. The Crown and Church of England with a steady opposition resisted the entrance and encroachment of the secularized ecclesiastical power of the Pope in England. The last rejection of it was no more than a successful effort after many a failure in struggles of the like kind." Thus wrote the late Cardinal Manning¹ before he had yet renounced the Church of his baptism ; and the preceding pages will have been written in vain if the reader does not at once recognize the absolute truth of his assertions' (pp. 320-1).

This verily is like using the vessels which the Syrians 'cast away in their haste'! In the four chapters which conclude the first volume, Canon Overton tells once more, but in a very fresh and attractive manner the well-known story of 'the last rejection' of the Papal power, and the varying fortunes of the liberated Church under Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth. Here we are again on generally familiar ground, and we must pass over much on which we would gladly comment, if we are to do even scant justice to the second volume. Before, however, we lay down the first volume we must allude to the frequent biographical passages which display our author in his happiest vein, such as those upon Hugh of Lincoln (pp. 213-15), William of Wykeham (pp. 287-92), William of Waynflete (pp. 315-18), the triumvirate of William Cecil, Nicholas Bacon, and Matthew Parker (pp. 433-9, and Hooker (pp. 478-81).² And we must refer to the lucid treatment of constitutional questions, such as the nature of Convocation (pp. 253-6), and the unravelling of intricate controversies, such as the Roman and Puritan positions in the reign of Queen Elizabeth (pp. 452, 461).³

The frontispiece of the second volume is a map which shows the dioceses of England and Wales after the formation

¹ *Unity of the Church*, p. 36.

² Compare Mr. Gladstone's *Romanes Lecture*, p. 26.

³ See a paper on 'The English Church in the reign of Queen Elizabeth' in Dr. Bright's *The Roman See in the Early Church and other Studies in Church History*, p. 422. Canon Overton does not mention this in his list of authorities ; nor, we note, does he give any original text of Bede in his list—a sad blot. On the first twenty years of Elizabeth see the *Church Quarterly Review*, No. 80, p. 405.

of the new sees in the time of Henry VIII. Canon Overton's delineation may be filled in in detail from the sketch maps based on the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* of this period in the *Historical Church Atlas* (pp. 53-70).¹ This volume is slightly less in bulk than the first, for the letterpress, including the list of authorities (p. 423) and the index (p. 440), occupies 458 pages. The first eight chapters are devoted to the Stuart period; then come three chapters which cover the reigns of the Georges and bring us down to 1833; and in conclusion there are two chapters on the Oxford Movement and its issues. 'In the picture of the Church in the time of Charles I.'s power, the figure of Laud stands out so very prominently that it casts all other figures into the shade' (p. 80), and we should naturally select Canon Overton's treatment of the great archbishop as an illustration of this part of his work, if it were not that two articles on Archbishop Laud have appeared in our own pages,² which give 'a fuller account' of Canon Overton's views on Laud 'than the limits of this work will allow' (p. 63, note 1). We need only here add that a careful perusal of recent Laudian biography has not led Canon Overton to alter what he had previously written in any material degree (p. 102). With the elaborate account of the facts which led Mr. Gladstone to speak of 'the brain-force' of Laud³ may be contrasted the more concise paragraphs on Oliver Cromwell (pp. 114-19). We cannot select typical names from the 'galaxy in the firmament of the Church' in the seventeenth century (p. 124) which shall illustrate anything like the whole of the theological work of that period, and we shall not attempt to do so. But we will just say that it was reserved to Bishop Ken, who was not a great producer of theological work, to exhibit a beautiful contrast between his own character and the later Stuart age, and anyone who looks out Canon Overton's references to Ken in the reigns of Charles II. and James II. will gain a very true impression of Ken's saintliness.

It is not our purpose to dwell upon Canon Overton's chapters which cover the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. For the student who knows the value of Canon Overton's larger works on those periods,⁴ it is not necessary to say that

¹ In April and July 1895.

² *Romanes Lecture*, p. 39.

³ Comp. Newman, *Parochial Sermons*, ii. 340: 'Our great Archbishop and Martyr, to whom perchance we owe it, that we who now live are still members of a branch of the Church Catholic.'

⁴ *Church Quarterly Review*, No. 75, p. 87.

these fresh accounts are written by a master's hand. And for readers—we hope that they will be many—who are willing to be guided by our opinion, and think of procuring these excellent volumes for their instruction, it is enough to say that Canon Overton knows what the salient points are, and sets them before us in a concise and luminous narrative. The final chapter, on the controversies and work of the stage of 'contemporary recollection' (p. 349), especially under its second section, is one of the best pieces of Church Defence that we have read in recent years. We make no apology for concluding with a somewhat long example of Canon Overton's very vigorous style:

'One question naturally suggests itself in conclusion: If what has been written in the latter half of this chapter is even approximately true, is not the present a strange time to agitate for the disestablishment and disendowment of an institution which has so good a record to show? Of course, no true Churchman thinks for a moment that any action on the part of the State can injure the Church as a spiritual, Divinely-appointed society. Her position in that capacity would be precisely the same as it is now if she were disendowed, or, in plain words, robbed, of what is on the most obvious principles of property rightfully her own. But will not the nation think twice—yea, thrice—before it cuts itself adrift as a nation from the oldest, the grandest, the most practically useful society that exists in the land? *It is the oldest.* It was 'established,' not by the State, for there *was* no one State to establish anything, but by its own inherent force, when this land was nothing but a congeries of different and often hostile tribes. There has been no break in its continuity from that day to this; for the theory that a new Church was erected in the sixteenth century is one that has been consigned by all competent historians, some of whom are very far indeed from holding a brief for the Church, to the limbo of exploded fallacies. *It is the grandest.* "There are not many grand things left in England," said the late Lord Beaconsfield in his old age, "but the National Church is one of them."¹ An illustration may be borrowed from one of its own buildings. Pull down an old Gothic cathedral, or one of those grand old parish churches which are dotted about the country.² No amount of money, skill, or taste, can raise one like it in its place. The new erection may be more garish, but not so grand. There will be something lacking which only time and hallowed associations with the past can give. *It is the most practically useful.* Its antiquity and its grandeur might be regarded as too sentimental a consideration for this utilitarian age; but put it on the lowest grounds of utility, and surely it would be a most suicidal policy to destroy it. Of the many great schemes of practical usefulness which have been started

¹ Introduction to *Lothair*.

² See *Lyra Apostolica*, No. 1; and a very striking and beautiful passage in the Memoir of Principal Tulloch, pp. 468-9.

and successfully carried out by Englishmen, how many are there of them of which the National Church could not say "quorum pars magna fui"? Observe the absurd disproportion between the sums contributed by Churchmen to almost any benevolent object of general interest, and those contributed by all other societies put together; take away what has been given by Churchmen, and how much will be left? (pp. 419-21).¹

SHORT NOTICES.

1. *Die altisraelitische Überlieferung in inschriftlicher Beleuchtung.* Ein Einspruch gegen die Aufstellungen der modernen Pentateuchkritik. Von Dr. FRITZ HOMMEL. (Munich: Hermann Lukaschik, 1897.)
2. *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition, as Illustrated by the Monuments.* A Protest against the Modern School of Old Testament Criticism. By Dr. FRITZ HOMMEL. Translated into English by EDMUND MCCLURE, M.A., and LEONARD CROSSLÉ. With a Map. Published under the Direction of the Tract Committee. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1897.)

THE appearance of Professor Hommel's work on Old-Israelitish tradition has excited considerable interest abroad as well as in England in the translation published by the S. P. C. K. It has, in fact, been already so much discussed, from different points of view, that we propose here to attempt merely a brief general estimate of the work rather than to repeat details of criticism. The title page very plainly states that the book is intended as 'a protest against the modern school of Old Testament criticism.' Coming in Dr. Hommel's name, such a challenge will appeal alike to friend and foe, but we fear that the result will please neither. For, strange to say, the author is by no means 'orthodox' in matters of Biblical criticism. He admits, for instance, apparently without question, the existence of various sources in the Pentateuch, though differing from the Wellhausen school as to their dates. A similar discrepancy is to be found among the Higher Critics themselves, some placing the composition of, e.g., the passages known as the Priestly Code as early as 900 B.C., others as late as 500 B.C. Professor Hommel's arguments are chiefly directed to proving that the document is not post-Exilic, but we look in vain for a definite statement of the date which he would himself assign to it. He merely claims to show 'that those very traditions . . . contain a whole host of records, the antiquity and genuineness of which are vouched for by external evidence.' Surely even the Higher Critic may admit as much as this. The

¹ We can answer this pertinent question by definite figures in regard to the Hospital Sunday Fund. This fund yields annually, roughly speaking, 40,000*l.*; of this sum the Church of England collects 32,000*l.* In Canon Overton's own county, the native county of Wesley, Hospital Sunday yields about 900*l.*; of this sum the Church of England collects about 800*l.*

evident agreement between much of the earlier part of Genesis and the Babylonian religious or historical literature, taken together with the evidently wide-spread use of writing throughout Western Asia, is enough to prove at least such a possibility. But it is when Professor Hommel tries to be more precise that he becomes less convincing. On p. 11, to prove that Deuteronomy 'must have been known to the prophets at least as early as . . . about 740 B.C.,' he claims to find a quotation from it in Hosea. On examining the passages (Deut. xxviii. 68 with Hosea viii. 13, ix. 3) we find no sign that either writer has borrowed from the other, no strange expression, no peculiarity in the Hebrew which would warrant our regarding the recurrence of so natural an expression as anything more than a mere coincidence. Many such 'quotations' would hardly amount to one proof. Yet this instance is typical of the method employed. It is ingenious and learned, but at the same time it is intricate and often illusory. Glad as we are to see the tradition supported by external arguments, many of them seem quite out of place in what is clearly intended as a popular work. Moreover we had expected more from Professor Hommel. A scholar so competent to deal both with Babylonian and Arabian inscriptions might have given us something more solid than a combination of hypothesis and speculation. A view is not necessarily to be condemned as speculative because it is new, but the unbiassed reader can hardly avoid passing such a judgment on the present volume. Whatever the final verdict is to be on many of the points in dispute, archæological research is the most valuable means of arriving at it; but no advantage is gained by straining the evidence; we must be content to investigate and wait. This is exactly what the author seems unwilling to do. Instead of using only well-ascertained results (the proper method for a popular writer to pursue), he bases his argument mainly on the evidence of proper names which he endeavours to illustrate from the S. Arabian inscriptions. The Higher Critic says 'in a certain document the names found are of late formation, therefore the document is late.' Professor Hommel would answer that the names are early, therefore the document is early. The two main objections to this method are (1) that the reading of the names in these inscriptions is often doubtful and their interpretation uncertain; (2) that the S. Arabian inscriptions are very imperfectly known even to specialists, since the majority of those collected by Dr. Glaser have never yet been published, and meanwhile opinions are very much divided as to their date and significance. There is, therefore, much to be done before their evidence can be safely applied. Besides proper names Professor Hommel also finds Arabic etymologies for various ritual terms. As it is not our intention to go into details, we will only say that many of these appear to be at least unconvincing. On these grounds he decides that the Israelites were an Arab tribe, speaking an Arabic dialect, which they abandoned for the Canaanitish language, now called Hebrew, on their entry into the Promised Land. It will naturally be asked, Why elaborate on such slight grounds a theory which seems neither to be necessary nor to fit the facts of the Biblical narrative? The reason

is this : If the Priestly Code were a late post-Exilic production, 'we should expect it to contain a large number of Babylonian and Aramaic loan-words.' If, however, the Israelites up to the Exodus spoke an Arabic dialect, we should expect to find technical terms derived from Arabic in a document of the time of the Exodus. We do find such terms in the Priestly Code, 'the obvious source of them being traceable . . . to the ancient relations between Israel and Midian (Moses and Jethro).' The conclusion is that Israel was of Arab stock and the Priestly Code belongs to the time of the Exodus. It looks perilously like an *argumentum in circulo*. We may point out at any rate that from these arguments one of two other conclusions must also be drawn : If the Priestly Code was written down at the time of the Exodus, it must have been written in the supposed Arabic dialect and translated at a later period ; if the Priestly Code was written in Hebrew, it must have been some considerable time after the entry into Canaan, when Israel had adopted the Hebrew language. In conclusion, while we cannot admit all Professor Hommel's arguments, we must admire his ingenuity and learning ; and though we are far from sharing his contempt for textual and grammatical investigations, we heartily concur in his appeal to the younger school of Old Testament theologians to devote themselves to the study of Assyro-Babylonian and S. Arabian inscriptions.¹

We had intended to call attention to certain discrepancies between the German and English forms of this work, but a letter of Mr. McClure's in the *Guardian* of November 24 fortunately removes the necessity for doing so. We gladly take this opportunity of stating, on the authority of Mr. McClure, that Professor Hommel accepts the full responsibility for the alterations, which he authorized after examination and before the publication of the English version. We have compared very closely the original with the translation, page by page and line by line, and we are prepared to say that in the whole of the S.P.C.K. version of 327 pages there are not a dozen of which the margin of our copy is not scored with errata, and some of them, in our judgment, very serious errata, and perhaps still more serious omissions. How Dr. Hommel can have tolerated such departures from the original text passes man's understanding. We can but regret that the *Tract Committee* thought it consistent with their duty to the public to suppress the fact that such alterations had been made. In the unfortunate case of the S.P.C.K. version of Maspero's *Struggle of the Nations* the *General Literature Committee* did its best to atone for the far graver alterations which had been surreptitiously

¹ This book is by no means light reading. Those who wish for a more popular *résumé* of the results aimed at by the author may be referred to a short paper by him in a most interesting volume entitled *Recent Research in Bible Lands, its Progress and Results*, edited by Herman V. Hilprecht. Philadelphia : J. D. Wattles and Co., 1896.) See p. 129 seq. Professor Hommel there writes (p. 157) : 'It is my conviction that Arabia itself will furnish us the direct proofs that the modern destructive criticism of the Pentateuch is absolutely erroneous.'

introduced for divers purposes, by issuing a Notice which, if stated in the Preface when the book came out, would have gone a long way to disarm hostile criticism. For our own part we are only too pleased to be relieved from the necessity of pursuing the subject further, and will only say in conclusion that we think it is to be regretted that Mr. McClure should have allowed so contemptuous and almost resentful a tone to appear in a controversy which, of all others, ought to be conducted in a temperate and scholarly spirit.

1. *Studia Sinaitica*. No. V. *Apocrypha Sinaitica*. Edited and translated by MARGARET DUNLOP GIBSON, M.R.A.S. (London: Clay, 1896.)
2. *Some Pages of the Four Gospels retranscribed from the Sinaitic Palimpsest*. With a Translation of the whole Text. By AGNES SMITH LEWIS. (London: Clay, 1896.)
3. *Collatio Codicis Lewisiani rescripti Evangeliorum Sacrorum Syriacorum cum Codice Curetoniano*. Auctore ALBERTO BONUS, A.M. (Oxonii, e prelo Clarendoniano, 1896.)

1. *STUDIA SINAITICA*, No. V., containing certain apocrypha in Syriac and Arabic, with an English translation by Mrs. Gibson, is another volume of the series undertaken with praiseworthy zeal by the two Cambridge ladies whose names are well known in connexion with the discovery of the Sinaitic palimpsest of the Syriac Gospels. So far the series contains mainly the results of their investigations made during several successive visits to the Monastery of St. Katharine. In the present volume the most interesting items are the Syriac and Arabic versions of the 'Anaphora Pilati' and the Arabic versions of the 'Recognitions of Clement.' Both of these documents are, of course, already well known in other forms—Syriac, Greek, or Latin—and some readers will be inclined to question how far it was worth while to publish texts of such limited interest and doubtful value. We are, however, far from depreciating the value of such work, and feel glad that Mrs. Gibson has had the opportunity of taking up this rather thankless task. It is only in comparatively recent years that serious attention has been paid to the more obscure apocryphal texts, but good work is being done on them (especially at Cambridge by Dr. James and Professor Armitage Robinson), and, in order to arrive at a true estimate of their value, the more versions we have the better. Mrs. Gibson believes the Arabic version of the 'Anaphora' to have been translated from the Greek, an opinion in which we fully concur. In fact, there seems to have been a period in the history of the monastery on Mount Sinai when the monks took to translating large parts of their hagiological literature into Arabic. The text of the 'Recognitions' is certainly from the Greek, as stated in the colophon, but it is taken from a British Museum manuscript not of Sinaitic origin. It is much shorter than the Latin, and probably, as Mrs. Gibson suggests, is merely an excerpt. The difference between the various recensions of these documents constitutes one of the main difficulties in the study of them. It is for this reason that every new version is of value as contributing towards the deter-

mination of their 'primitive form and subsequent history' (p. xii). The other texts included in the volume (all in Arabic) are: the Martyrdom of Clement; the Preaching of Peter (an account of a miracle worked by St. Peter, and in no way connected with either the early or later Πέτρον κήρυγμα or the Διδασκαλία Πέτρον); the Martyrdom of James, son of Alphæus; the Preaching and Martyrdom of Simon son of Cleophas. The work of editing the texts appears to be carefully done, and the translation, apart from a few errors, is satisfactory. We must, however, differ from Mrs. Gibson as to the date of MS. No. 445 (Sinai), of which two facsimiles are given. A glance at the writing alone is sufficient to show that it cannot belong to the year 799 A.D., and it is inconceivable that anyone should think so. The facsimile (facing p. 55 of the Arabic) clearly gives this not as the date of the writing of the manuscript, but of some other event previously mentioned. The date 1233 A.D. assigned to it in Mrs. Gibson's catalogue is much more likely, and thus its value as being 'four centuries earlier than any of the Greek texts hitherto known' altogether disappears. MS. 508 (facsimile facing the first page of the Arabic) is much earlier, to judge from the writing. So grave an error arouses a feeling of distrust as to the editor's judgment in other matters.

2. *Some Pages of the Four Gospels retranscribed from the Sinaitic Palimpsest* by Mrs. Lewis. This is not a new work, but is supplementary to the original edition of the Sinaitic text of the Syriac Gospels. It will be remembered that the palimpsest was partly copied on the spot, and much of the rest was afterwards deciphered from photographs. In spite, however, of all the care and skill bestowed on the work many passages still remained uncertain or illegible. With a view to filling up lacunæ and settling doubtful readings, Mrs. Lewis and her sister made another journey to the monastery early in 1895, and the present volume is the result. The pages of the original edition which were defective are here reprinted, the corrections and additions being coloured blue. This is not the place to speak of the characteristics of the text and its relation to the Curetonian and other versions. A short account of its main features will be found in the Introduction. It may perhaps be worth mentioning, however, that the re-examination of the manuscript confirms some of its striking peculiarities. The most remarkable ('Joseph . . . begat Jesus,' Matt. i. 16) is, Mrs. Lewis assures us, undoubtedly correct; the twelve verses at the end of St. Mark also can never have formed part of this codex. It is hardly necessary to point out the great importance of establishing the readings of the new text; we need only say that these corrections will be indispensable to students of the Syriac versions. The accompanying translation is the same as that published in 1894, but with the additions incorporated and with fewer marginal notes. There are also two appendices comparing the text with that of Westcott and Hort, not with the *textus receptus*, as at the end of the translation of 1894. Appendix I. contains a 'list of words and phrases in the Greek . . . which are omitted in this version . . .'; Appendix II.,

a 'V'
the C
appea
gain
unifo
the c

3.
the S
readi
taken
duced
regret
sponc
of our
purpo
colum
Prefa
pariso
tonian
or re
two to
Peshi
the c
fidem
found
again
the te
times
(8) or
the P
useful
correc

The E
C
F
D
u
fo

THIS
sketch
'evid
is deve
Dr
is clear
are bri
Old T
table o
It may
part of

a 'list of words and phrases in this version which are omitted in the Greek. . . . ' Tables of this kind are always useful, and, as they appear to be carefully done, the work as a whole will be a distinct gain for the study of the text. We may add that the volume is uniform in every respect with the original edition, and so pagged that the corrected leaves can be conveniently inserted therein.

3. In Mr. Bonus's *Collatio Codicis Lewisiani rescripti* the text of the Sinaitic Syriac is collated with the Curetonian, and with selected readings of the Peshitto. It is a very hopeful sign of the interest taken in these studies that a work of the kind should have been produced so soon after the publication of the new text. It is to be regretted that Mr. Bonus does not give a full collation of the corresponding parts of the Peshitto. Perhaps he considers that the state of our editions of the Peshitto is not satisfactory enough for the purpose. The collation is conveniently arranged in three parallel columns, and appears to be most accurate and scholarly. The Preface (in Latin) points out the chief results reached by a comparison of the texts: (1) the Sinaitic is much shorter than the Curetonian, but the author does not decide whether it is therefore earlier or represents a 'reformed' text; (2) the differences between these two texts are much greater than between various manuscripts of the Peshitto; (3) the Sinaitic often omits words which few or none of the other authorities omit, a fact which 'nonnullis palimpsesti fidem in suspicionem vocare potest'; (4) it often has readings not found elsewhere; (5) in many places it has 'Our Lord' for 'Jesus' against all the other authorities; (6) as regards the subdivision of the text, the Peshitto agrees sometimes with the Sinaitic and sometimes with the Curetonian; (7) the Sinaitic has scribal errors and (8) orthographical peculiarities; (9) the Sinaitic often agrees with the Peshitto against the Curetonian. The author has added to the usefulness of his work by taking into account the recently published corrections noticed above.

The Bible in the Light of To-day. By CHARLES CROSLEGH, D.D., Chaplain of the Royal Indian Engineering College, Cooper's Hill; some time Donnellan Lecturer in the University of Dublin; Author of *Christianity Judged by its Fruits*. Published under the direction of the Tract Committee. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1896.)

THIS work consists of three parts. The first part is a 'historical sketch' of the 'growth of the Bible'; the second part deals with the 'evidence' which shows that the Bible is 'from God'; the third part is devoted to 'answers to objections.'

Dr. Crosleg'h's statement of the facts about the text of the Bible is clear and useful. The most important manuscripts and versions are briefly described. The history of the growth of the canon of the Old Testament and the New Testament is given. There is a useful table of the 'lineage' of the 'textus receptus' of the New Testament. It may be doubted whether he does not go beyond the evidence in part of what he says about the date of the canon of the Old Testament.

In some points, as when he does not indicate any knowledge of the recovery of Tatian's *Diatessaron* (p. 47),¹ or when he refers to Bishop Lightfoot's articles bearing on the authorship of St. John's Gospel in the *Contemporary Review* for 1875 without any mention of the articles and lectures published in the work entitled *Biblical Essays* (p. 64), he does not appear to be fully abreast of the literature of his subject. But, when full allowance is made for any features of this kind, the first part of the book may still be regarded as supplying students with a very useful elementary treatment of the text and canon of the Bible.

The second part is of a more theological character. The Divine authority of Holy Scripture is stated to be shown by the testimony of the Church, the testimony of the Bible itself, the general characteristics of the Bible, and especially its unity in diversity, its spiritual power and moral fruitfulness, and the fulfilment of its promises in the experience of Christians and the facts of history. Passing on to consider what is meant by saying that the Bible is from God, the author asserts strongly the Divine use of human instrumentality, and bases much of his treatment of the question on the parallel of the phraseology whereby in Holy Scripture God is often said to have done something which in the ordinary language of the present time would be spoken of as the result of a natural process, as when it is said that God planted the cedars of Libanus,² or that He gave Israel a king.³

In the third part the point of view last mentioned is more fully developed. The existence of verbal inaccuracies in the Old and the New Testament, and of discrepancies between one passage and another and between the Bible and secular history, is freely admitted. Matters of natural science are said to be outside the scope of the Divine teaching contained in Holy Scripture, since 'theology and science' 'move in different planes' and 'collision between them is impossible' (p. 309). The morality of the Old Testament is a progressive morality, and any estimate of its value must take into consideration the circumstances and needs of particular times. While the arguments of criticism are to be cautiously weighed, the Divine authority of the books of the Old Testament does not depend upon questions of date or authorship. The presence of error invalidates neither the inspiration of the Bible nor its utility as a guide of life.

The tone of the book is reverent, and it is marked by signs of an earnest desire to commend the spiritual teaching of the Bible to those who have difficulty in accepting its claims. There is much in it which may serve to promote a better knowledge of some characteristics of Holy Scripture. As a whole it is a failure, because the writer has not faced the question of the extent to which the Bible is an infallible teacher on matters of faith and morality, or what is involved in its separation from other works of God by its forming the sacred canon. What he has given us about the human aspect of

¹ On p. 83, note ¹, however, he refers to 'recent investigations into the text' of the New Testament 'used in Tatian's *Diatessaron*.'

² Ps. civ. 16.

³ Hosea, xiii. 11.

the B
which

W
ment
symp
widely
as if
Mose
he is
Mosa
Lord
the p
its au
the 'I
be so
of ou
attrib

Chur

I
I
T
R

Dr. S
before
Book
the gr
Manu
ness
earlies
His w
to mar
clergy
two qu
in the

'T
of the
diminis
and his
the fin
book of
but in
which
canonic
where
letter f
Mornin
English

In
Burial
funeral

the Bible is much more valuable than his treatment of the aspect which is Divine.

While Dr. Croslegh pleads that the authority of the Old Testament is independent of critical opinions, it is plain that his own sympathies are not in the direction of accepting the theories now widely popular. He refers incidentally to the Book of Ecclesiastes as if it were the work of Solomon (p. 147); he speaks of the 'Law of Moses' in connexion with the coming out from Egypt (p. 221); and he is at some pains to show part of the evidence for the antiquity and Mosaic character of the Law (pp. 378-83). In his treatment of our Lord's quotation of Psalm cx. (pp. 366-7) he misses the point that the psalm is not simply quoted as David's, but the fact of David being its author is made the basis of an argument. In what he says about the 'limitation of our Lord's knowledge' (pp. 364-7) there appears to be some confusion between the Divine and the human knowledge of our Lord, and a failure to see the absolute impossibility of the attributes of the Godhead undergoing change.

Church Services and Service Books before the Reformation. By HENRY BARCLAY SWETE, D.D., Litt.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. Published under the direction of the Tract Committee. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1896.)

DR. SWETE has given us, in his *Church Services and Service Books before the Reformation*, a very useful manual on the sources of the Book of Common Prayer. Taking the Services of the Church in the groups suggested by the mediæval books, the Breviary, Missal, Manual, Processional, and Pontifical, he describes with great clearness and sufficient fulness their character and history from the earliest times to the time of the compilation of the Prayer Book. His work is likely to be of great value to candidates for ordination, to many of the laity, and, if they will study it, to not a few of the clergy. The point of view from which it is written may be seen from two quotations. Writing of the changes made in the English Services in the sixteenth century, Dr. Swete says:

'The clergy may have suffered in some degree by the sweeping away of the old system, and the artistic beauty of the offices has certainly been diminished. But the cost had been counted, and it seemed to Cranmer and his friends to be light in comparison with the gain. We have lost the finished perfection of the mediæval services, but we have gained a book of truly common prayer. The canonical hours have been abandoned, but in place of them a daily Order of Morning and Evening Prayer, in which priest and people worship God together, has been restored. The canonical Hours had become in England, as they are still in countries where the Church has not undergone reformation, practically a dead letter for all but the monastic bodies and the priesthood: the Order of Morning and Evening Prayer is a living rite for which thousands of the English laity can bless God' (pp. 22-3).

'In the second Prayer Book the work of reconstruction' of the Burial Service 'was carried much further; the special forms for use at a funeral Celebration were abandoned, and every vestige of direct inter-

cession for the dead was swept away. The result has been to crush out of English life the mediæval belief in a purgatorial fire, but at the cost of sacrificing practices undoubtedly dear to the early Church and of eliminating from English Christianity one important side of the ancient doctrine of the intermediate state. It has left us, however, an Order for the Burial of the Dead which, notwithstanding these defects, is more consolatory, more inspiring, and, upon the whole, nearer to the spirit of the primitive belief than any which was known in England from the days of Augustine of Canterbury to the middle of the sixteenth century' (pp. 170-1).¹

Among a very few minor defects we notice that the account of the early history of Unction of the Sick (pp. 156-7) is defective, and that, evidently by a slip of the pen, it is stated that the part of Psalm cxix. appointed for use at Prime consists of the 'last two sections' (p. 62).

Vox Liturgiæ Anglicanæ. The History of the Book of Common Prayer in its Bearing on Present Eucharistic Controversies. With a Preface touching on the ancillary evidence of contemporary writings and doings. By the Rev. N. DIMOCK, A.M. (London: Elliot Stock, 1897.)

MR. DIMOCK'S intention in this book is to prove that the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence in the Holy Eucharist is contradicted by, and was purposely excluded from, the Book of Common Prayer. With this in view he has compiled much interesting material, and his book is marked by a reverent and earnest tone. Its value for his purpose, however, is destroyed by a failure to realize points which are essential to a proper understanding alike of this particular question and of the general teaching of the Prayer Book. He supposes that a rejection of Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation necessarily implies a rejection of the Real Objective Presence. He ignores the extent to which the Prayer Book of 1552 was lacking in any kind of acceptance by the Church. He minimizes the differences between

¹ A valuable note is added to the passage above quoted: 'Canon Wordsworth reminds me that the consequences of the omission of a form for Celebration at burials "began at once to be felt and as far as possible supplied. At the funeral of Henry II., King of France, which was solemnized in St. Paul's, Parker, Barlow, Scory, the Lord Chamberlain, and certain noblemen received the Communion (Sept. 9, 1559). And not long afterwards (Dec. 5, 1559), the sisters of Lady Jane Grey among others received the Sacrament at their brother's funeral at Westminster, when Jewel was the preacher, and Dr. May, Dean of St. Paul's, the celebrant (Strype, *Annals*, i. cc. 9, 15). Further, in the next year (April 6, 1560), so far as the Queen's power could go, she authorized the use of such a service at the Universities, and at Winchester and Eton (Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* no. 50; *Liturgical Services of Queen Elizabeth*, p. 430 *sq.*). And the use has been allowed in cathedral and other churches, possibly by Overall (Nicholls, p. 65), and in more recent times certainly by Bishop Chr. Wordsworth of Lincoln (1872), Bishop Mackarness of Oxford (1882); and the present Bishop of Salisbury in Synod (1896) authorized his clergy to apply to him for permission as occasion arose"' (p. 171, note ¹).

the P
1662.
signifi
tration
alterat
1662.
up for
which
have p

The P
th
T

THIS v
tells u
'origin
jects o
'Minis
tions o
'The C
Rubric
Myth),
'The S
'The O

Mr.
study to
great d
Anglica
more th
have an
has colle
Besides
rance to
very mu
use and
mend th

The Meth
of 1
Eng
No

THIS is a
the Meth
chizing h
Until the
without a
plied the
lectures w

It is p
would be
VOL. 2

the Prayer Book of 1552 and that of 1559, and, *a fortiori*, that of 1662. Nothing which he says is of any real weight to lessen the significance of the change made in 1559 in the Words of Administration, and the omission of the 'Black Rubric' in 1559 and the alteration in the wording of this rubric when it was reintroduced in 1662. No careful study or accurate knowledge of details can make up for the absence of hold on theological and historical principles which is implied in the features of *Vox Liturgie Anglicanæ* which we have pointed out.

The Prayer Book, Articles, and Homilies. Some forgotten Facts in their History which may decide their Interpretation. By J. T. TOMLINSON. (London : Elliot Stock, 1897.)

THIS volume contains thirteen articles, several of which, the preface tells us, have been reprinted from 'a periodical' in which they 'originally' 'appeared' 'as replies to current fallacies.' The subjects of the papers are : 'The Black-letter Holy Days,' 'The "Ministers and Mistakers" of the First Prayer Book,' 'The Injunctions of Elizabeth, 1559,' 'The Advertisements of Elizabeth, 1566,' 'The Ornaments Rubric (Elizabeth, 1559-1661),' 'The Ornaments Rubric (Charles II., 1662),' 'The Ornaments Rubric (the great Cosin Myth),' 'The Breaking of the Bread,' 'The First Book of Homilies,' 'The Second Book of Homilies,' 'The Declaration on Kneeling,' 'The Ordinal and Article XXXVI,' 'Article XXXI.'

Mr. Tomlinson shows that he has devoted much time and careful study to the subjects about which he writes. His volume contains a great deal of material which has its place in the history of the Anglican formularies. We are unable to regard him as anything more than an industrious collector. He does not appear to us to have any real grip of history or to be able to place the facts which he has collected in proper relation to one another or to other facts. Besides this want of historical sense, his partisan spirit is a hindrance to his writing a work of value. Consequently, while there is very much in the book before us which other writers may profitably use and fit into its proper historical setting, we are unable to commend the book itself.

The Method of St. Sulpice for the Organizing of Catechisms, with Plans of Instruction for the Various Catechisms. Translated into English. (London : Griffith, Farran, Browne, and Co., Limited. No date.)

THIS is a much-needed translation of the well-known French work the *Méthode de Saint-Sulpice*. Bishop Dupanloup's *Ministry of Catechizing* has been for some time in English, and has been widely read. Until the publication of the book now before us we have been without an English translation of the important treatise which supplied the foundation upon which the Bishop of Orleans based the lectures which were subsequently published under that title.

It is probable that a very large number of English parishes would be greatly benefited by the introduction of a method of

VOL. XLV.—NO. XC.

K K

catechizing based upon that which has become famous at St. Sulpice. There can be no doubt that in all parishes the catechizing of children forms a highly important part of the work of the clergy. For those who are introducing the method itself, the *Méthode de Saint-Sulpice*, either in its French or its English form, may be regarded as practically necessary.¹ Whatever system is adopted there is very much that is useful which may be learnt from this book.

It is right that we should mention that the translation before us gives without material alteration what is contained in the French work. It thus takes for granted both the whole doctrinal system of the Church of Rome and the practical methods which are in use in Roman Catholic countries. For instance, the regulations and advice for securing that the children who attend the Catechism make their confessions at regulated times to appointed confessors are fully given, and it is assumed that the reception of Confirmation will follow First Communion. We do not doubt that the translator has acted rightly in preserving unaltered these features of the original work. It is obvious that the clergy of the Church of England must exercise discretion in their use of it.

The Child: its Spiritual Nature. By HENRY KING LEWIS, Compiler of *Songs for Little Singers in the Sunday School and Home.* (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1896.)

THIS is a very mischievous book. The doctrines of original sin and baptismal regeneration are attacked. The Services of the Book of Common Prayer are misunderstood. The history of the early Church is misrepresented. The teaching of Christians, whether Roman Catholics or English Church people or Presbyterians or Congregationalists (pp. 182-3), is described as the 'stuffy school-room of a heartless theology' (p. 191). It is true, as the author writes, that 'the tracing of the mental and physical aspects of childhood' 'must be regarded as quite subordinate to the' 'spiritual' 'point of view,' and that this is 'of intense practical importance' (Preface, p. v). It will not be found that the rejection of historical Christianity is a help to the development of the spiritual side of the nature either of children or of adults, or a step towards realizing the meaning of the words of 'the great Teacher' in 'the free inspiring air of' His 'presence' 'under heaven's blue sky and by the side of the Lake of Galilee' (p. 191).

A Cornish Parish; being an Account of St. Austell, Town, Church, District, and People. By JOSEPH HAMMOND, LL.B., Vicar; Author of *Church and Chapel?—an Eirenicon*; *Concerning the Church*, &c. (London: Skeffington and Son, 1897.)

CANON HAMMOND is well known as the writer of books and pamphlets bearing on the questions at issue between Church and Dissent.

¹ In saying this we do not forget the very useful book *The Clergy and the Catechism*, by the Rev. Spencer Jones. We think English clergy who are beginning the 'method' ought to have this as well as the *Method of St. Sulpice* and the *Ministry of Catechizing*.

He
he is
indus
usefu
Cano
wood
the t
Trini
sists
angel
in pra
tion o
figure
again
suppo
identi
tinguis
figures
remark
twenty
shields
and fo
shields
eight o
'begin
are he
wish,
some d
Can
aimed
'Ali
our sho
handbo
sively, I
whilst f
grants (
"Accou
have tre
a portra
(Preface

The
various
the phot

He has now published a book on St. Austell, the parish of which he is vicar. It contains an account of the name and history and industries and general characteristics of the town and parish, and a useful description of the very interesting church and registers. Canon Hammond directs attention in particular to the carvings in wood and stone in which the church is rich. On the west front of the tower there is 'a remarkable, if rude, representation of the Trinity'; underneath this, a 'representation of Hades,' which 'consists of a sort of sheet, grasped on either side by the hands of an angel, standing in which appear four figures with their hands folded in prayer,' 'waiting under the shadow of the Cross and the benediction of the Father for the day of recompense'; lower down are two figures of 'the angel Gabriel' and 'the Blessed Virgin'; lower down again are three figures, the central one of which 'has long been supposed to represent St. Austolus,' but which Canon Hammond identifies as our Lord carrying the 'Cross of the Resurrection,' 'distinguished by the banner or miniature flag attached to it,' the side figures being those of a bishop and a priest (pp. 114-8). Another remarkable feature is the 'ancient clock-face with its four-and-twenty bosses or circles' (p. 119); and a still more interesting set of shields, fifteen in number, 'illustrates the south side of the church and forms an exposition of the Passion of our Lord' (p. 122). These shields are described in some detail (pp. 122-34), and illustrations of eight of them from drawings by the author are given. The registers 'begin with the year 1564' (p. 160). Specimen pages and years are here printed from them, and the author expresses the 'pious wish,' which we heartily reciprocate, that the 'earlier registers may some day be published *in extenso*' (p. 205).

Canon Hammond thus describes the objects at which he has aimed in writing this book:

'Alike for the people of St. Austell and its vicinity as for visitors to our shores, I have compiled an unpretentious history of the town and handbook to the Church; for the latter more especially, but not exclusively, I have added a description of our parish and neighbourhood, whilst for the reading public who are neither inhabitants nor immigrants (who may at the same time, as I hope, find in the preliminary "Account of St. Austell" something to interest and instruct them) I have treated of our parish as a "Corner of Cornwall," and have attempted a portrait, an outline, of the Cornish people, their manners and customs' (Preface, p. viii).

The book is well calculated to be interesting and useful to the various classes of readers who are in view; its value is increased by the photographs and other illustrations which it contains.

Origin and Development of the Nicene Theology, with some Reference to the Ritschlian View of Theology and History of Doctrine. Lectures delivered on the L. P. Stone Foundation at Princeton Theological Seminary in January 1896. By HUGH M. SCOTT, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Chicago Theological Seminary. (Chicago: Chicago Theological Seminary Press, 1896.)

Dr. SCOTT mentions in his preface (p. ii) his personal knowledge of many German writers on Theology, and his lectures show how carefully he has studied the German theological literature of the present day. This adds value to his earnest repudiation of the line of thought associated with the systems of Ritschl and Harnack. Whatever exception might be taken to occasional expressions which he uses with regard to the theology of the Incarnation, his teaching is emphatically Christian on the central points. He states with vigour that 'the Christology of the Apostolic Church' 'contains all the essentials of the Nicene theology'; 'if Paul was right, then Athanasius was not wrong' (p. 52); the 'doctrinal decisions of Nicæa' were not the 'creation of doctrinal development,' but the 'recognition of truth, which is ever the same' (p. 371). Thus, he sees that the struggle at Nicæa

'was a battle for life and death to save Christianity from polytheism, from worship of a creature; it was also a fight to save even Theism, for if the creature Christ of Arius were adored, Christianity would sink below the level of even educated heathenism, which believed in one Supreme Being' (pp. 341-2).

And he has an appreciation of the Fathers which we do not always find in modern books on theology:

'The great superiority of our modern Christianity is largely imaginary. Those Fathers' (*i.e.* of Nicæa) 'had our Bible and our logic; their philosophy—materialistic, pantheistic, idealistic—is the current thought of our century. They had, as a living possession, that Greek culture of "the humanities" which our literary faith still makes the basis of all learning; they had all the facts necessary for forming opinions; they had that changeless Christian experience out of which all doctrine grows; hence Herrmann is constrained to say that "the Christological decisions of the ancient Church still always mark out the limits within which such attempts must move." Greek art simply recognized once for all the changeless laws of æsthetic proportion. There is no reason why Greek theology should not have recognized, once for all, the changeless truth about the Divine Christ' (pp. 371-2).

Dr. Scott's recognition of the facts about the theology of the Incarnation and his appreciation of the Fathers make it the more strange that he should reject the Sacramental doctrines to which the early Church was deeply committed. When he speaks of the 'monstrosities of Catholicism' (p. 84), we do not think he means only Roman Catholic exaggerations. Though he recognizes that Baptismal Regeneration is taught in the Epistle of Barnabas and by Hermas (pp. 198-9), as well as by Tertullian (p. 245) and Irenæus (p. 282), he regards it as 'a fall from salvation by grace into salvation

by w
doctr
but al
of Al
the 'g
much

TI
which
the ap
'Prac
which
doctri
gospel
are qu
"dogm
the wa
These
there
good o
are the

Religi
R
&
L

RELIG
of Fair
the aut
Testam
and St.
Epistle
Peter,
Relatio
This w
to stud
be sho
the Ro

'W
God—v
... cle
are exp
the dea
cisely s
death a
and the
the ben
and foll
but the
must as
Would
be effica

by works' (p. 200; cf. pp. 245-6). He rejects not only 'the doctrine of the Mass' which 'arose in the Middle Ages' (pp. 220-1), but also the Eucharistic teaching of Ignatius and Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Athanasius (pp. 248-9). He considers the 'growth of the Episcopal Church organization' to have had in it much that was 'conventional and arbitrary' (p. 113).

There is a description in the preface of 'various influences' which are now 'at work in American religious circles' which 'make the approach of' 'undogmatic Christianity' 'especially dangerous.' 'Practical people,' it is said, 'are apt to be caught by a theology which presents primitive Christianity as an "impression" and not a doctrine.' 'People in a hurry' 'are inclined to run after a "simple gospel" or "evangelical theology."' 'Restive, democratic people' are quick to shrink from the 'harsh, priestly sound' of 'the word "dogma."' The 'new science of "Christian Sociology"' 'prepares the way for Ritschl's theology of Christ and the Church' (pp. iii-iv). These 'influences' are, perhaps, not quite unknown in England; and there are English as well as American Churchmen who may derive a good deal of profit from the study of the more positive parts, which are the chief parts, of Dr. Scott's able and learned work.

Religious Faith. An Essay in the Philosophy of Religion. By the Rev. HENRY HUGHES, M.A., Author of *The Theory of Inference*, &c. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, and Co., Limited, 1896.)

RELIGIOUS FAITH consists of two books, the first on 'the meaning of Faith,' the second on 'the philosophy of Faith.' In the first book the author examines the idea of Faith as it is presented in the New Testament, taking separately the evidence afforded by St. Matthew and St. Mark, St. Luke, St. John, the Epistle to the Romans, the other Epistles of St. Paul, the Epistle to the Hebrews, St. James and St. Peter, and devoting chapters to 'The Problem to be Solved,' 'The Relation of Faith to Love and Hope,' and a 'Summary of Results.' This work is carefully and well done, and is likely to be very useful to students of the subject. The general attitude of the author may be shown by a passage which occurs in the chapter on the Epistle to the Romans:

'What, now, is the nature of the faith—additional to the old faith in God—which is the pre-requisite of justification? . . . The new faith . . . clearly involves a mental assent to whatever doctrines of the Gospel are expressed by the Lordship of Jesus Christ and His resurrection from the dead. And perhaps all these fundamental doctrines may be concisely stated thus:—the Deity and Incarnation of Jesus Christ; His death and resurrection and ascension into heaven for man's salvation; and the obligation under which men lie, who would avail themselves of the benefits of His Passion, to acknowledge Him as their living Master, and follow the example of His self-surrender. . . . Not the mind only, but the heart, must acquiesce in the truths assented to; and not only must assent be given, but the giving of assent must be proclaimed. . . . Would it, now, be unreasonable to conclude . . . that assent, in order to be efficacious, must be followed by submission to the rite of Baptism?

... Whether or not St. Paul may be rightly considered to be here' (*i.e.* in Romans x. 10) 'enunciating the principle that submission to Christian Baptism is a necessary part of saving faith in Christ, there can scarcely be any reasonable doubt that he held this doctrine. ... We seem to have in the Epistle ample confirmation of the teaching of St. John's Gospel as to the conditions under which persons who hear of Christ become believers in Him. Faith in Christ, we found, is represented by St. John as given by God, and given to those, and those only, who already have faith in Him. And this distinctly appears to be the doctrine which St. Paul lays down in reference to the same subject. The question, be it observed, does not relate to the opportunity, afforded to some and not to others, of coming within sound of the Gospel message; but it relates to the response, given by some and withheld by others, to the Gospel when it is proclaimed. ... The justifying or saving faith which we have been considering is the distinctive faith of the convert to Christianity; though, of course, so far as the nature of the case allows, it continues to be possessed by the baptized Christian. ... There appears ... to be some mention made of another kind of faith in Christ, a faith which belongs exclusively to those who have actually been baptized. St. Paul would seem to have in mind these two kinds of Christian faith when at the beginning of his Epistle he writes, "Therein" (that is, in the Gospel) "is revealed a righteousness of God by faith unto faith." Apparently, too, it must be the second kind of faith in Christ—though St. Paul does not now make mention of faith by name—that constitutes, in whole or in great part, the new animating consciousness which he refers to as fashioning the conduct of the baptized Christian. ... He taught the doctrine of a post-baptismal faith in Christ, causing the Christian to fashion his life after the guidance of the indwelling Spirit, and comprising an insight into the Mind of Christ' (pp. 64-70).

The chapters in the second book are entitled 'Historical Inference and Proof,' 'Revelation,' 'Religious Belief,' 'The Resurrection as Miracle,' 'The Human Will,' 'Faith in God,' 'Justifying Faith,' 'The Faith of Union with Christ,' 'Dr. Martineau,' 'Principal Caird.' They are marked by much thought and quiet power; the criticisms on Professor Huxley's and Professor T. H. Green's views on miracle and on Dr. Martineau's *Seat of Authority in Religion* and Principal Caird's *Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion* are at once acute and sober. Among much that is valuable we would direct special attention to the discussions of the evidence for the Resurrection of our Lord (pp. 176-83, 190-202).

Religious Faith, alike in its expositions of Holy Scripture and in its treatment of the more philosophic sides of the subject, is likely to be a very helpful book to those students who can give it time and real thought.

Philippian Studies. Lessons in Faith and Love from St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. By H. C. G. MOULE, D.D., Principal of Ridley Hall, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1897.)

The main object of this book is devotional. The Epistle to the Philippians is divided into sections, a short historical introduction is attached to each section, a revised translation with an explanatory paraphrase is given, and this is followed by an exposition of the

section
but t
many
is sel
befor
Philip

'T
with
made
taking
of the

A
'V
about
for th
fallibl
protec
qualit
once
self v
word
Kenô
It is j
the a
Bond
itself
Infall
our R
truste
please

The C
M
I

THIS
medit
as pic
chara
Lord
with
to eac
"the
the M
Seer."
the ex
and a
respo
becau
passa
'T
Holy

section. Dr. Moule, of course, writes as an Evangelical Churchman ; but the spiritual force and insight of his work will be helpful to many who on some matters cannot agree with him. And, indeed, it is seldom that such disagreement will be called out by the book before us. It is a satisfaction to us to notice that, in interpreting Philippians ii. 7, Dr. Moule says :

'The aorist participle, in Greek idiom, unites itself closely in thought with the aorist verb *ἐκένωσε* just previous. The resulting idea is not "He made Himself void, and then took," but "He made Himself void *by taking*." The "Exinanition" was, in fact, just this—the *taking the form of the δοῦλος*: neither less nor more' (pp. 93-4, note).

And in the exposition of this passage he says further :

'We are beset at the present day, on many sides, with speculations about the "Kenōsis" of the Lord which in some cases anyhow have it for their manifest goal to justify the thought that He condescended to be fallible ; that He "made Himself void" of such knowledge as should protect Him from mistaken statements about, for example, the history, quality, and authority of the Old Testament Scriptures. I have said once and again elsewhere that such an application of the "made Himself void," *ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν*, of this passage (from which alone we get the word Kenōsis for the Incarnation) is essentially beside the mark. The Kenōsis here is a very definite thing, as we see when we read the Greek. It is just this—the taking of "Bondservant's Form." It is—the becoming the absolute Human Bondservant of the Father. And the Absolute Bondservant must exercise a perfect Bondservice. . . . The Kenōsis itself (as St. Paul meant it) is nothing less than the guarantee of the Infallibility. . . . It says a profound and decisive Yes to the question, Is our Redeemer, as Man, "in the days of His flesh," to be absolutely trusted as the Truth in every syllable of assertion which He was actually pleased to make?' (pp. 99-101.)

The Great Example. By GEORGE HENRY SOMERSET WALPOLE, D.D., Principal of Bede College, Durham. (London, New York, and Bombay : Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897.)

THIS book consists of a series of nine addresses, with introductory meditations and concluding devotions, on the Ministry of the Church as pictured in the life of our Lord. The first address is of a general character ; the remaining eight follow the way of regarding our Lord's life which is suggested by the association of the four Gospels with the beasts in the vision of Ezekiel, two of them being devoted to each of the four subjects 'The Prophetic Office, or the Ministry of "the Man,"' 'The Lion, or the Ministry of "the King,"' 'The Ox, or the Ministry of "the Priest,"' and 'The Eagle, or the Ministry of "the Seer."' We learn from the preface that the substance, though not the exact words, of the addresses has been delivered at a Quiet Day and at a Retreat in America. They have been published partly in response to the wish expressed by clergy who heard them, and partly because of the 'belief' which the writer expresses in the following passage :

'There is still room for a book of devotions to help candidates for Holy Orders during the days immediately preceding their ordination.

Retreats for the Ember seasons, though happily common, are not universal, and there are not a few young men who, with the very best intentions to pass such a time seriously, find it difficult to know how they may employ it profitably. The aim of this little book is to supply their need; it therefore contains not only addresses on the fourfold life of the Ministry, but outlines of meditation together with some devotions. The passage of Scripture selected for meditation is intended to suggest the teaching that follows in the address, and the devotions to gather it up in short petitions and acts of praise. So it is hoped that those unable to share in the blessings of a Retreat may find help in making some preparation by themselves for entering into the thoughts of the greatest day of their lives' (Preface, p. vii).

The addresses contain much which is valuable on the life and work of the Ministry. For actual use in time of Retreat they would, in our opinion, have been more useful if the thoughts which they contain had rather been suggested in the form of headings than so fully developed, and if a larger proportion of space had been given to the life, as distinguished from the work, of the priest. There are a few sentences which we could wish differently expressed: for the most part the book may profitably be put into the hands of candidates for Holy Orders.

With Open Face; or, Jesus Mirrored in Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

By ALEXANDER BALMAIN BRUCE, D.D., Professor of Apologetics and New Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow.
(London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896.)

Of the thirteen chapters which make up this book nine appeared in the *Expositor* for 1896; the remaining four have not previously been published. The contents of the volume are described by the author as 'popular sketches of the spirit and teaching of our Lord,' and as being 'the overflow from severer studies on the first three Gospels meant to meet the wants of professional students of Scripture.' The last chapter consists of a 'Christian Primer,' 'an attempt' 'to set forth, for the instruction of children,' 'the main facts concerning Jesus' 'in the form of a historical Catechism' (Preface, pp. v-vi).

Some parts of the book may be useful to readers who are well grounded in Christian truth by helping them to realize more fully various aspects of our Lord's human life and ministry. Here and there what Professor Bruce says has apologetic value, as when he points out that the very obscurity of the reference to prophecy in the closing words of the second chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, 'He shall be called a Nazarene,' is an indication that the sojourn at Nazareth was not invented in order to make the incidents of our Lord's life correspond with the predictions of the prophets (pp. 2-3). Sometimes he uses a happy and instructive phrase, as when he says that the teaching of the scribes had 'turned' the Sabbath from 'a boon' 'into a tyranny' (p. 49); or makes a suggestion of interest, as when he comments on the resemblance of parts of the passage in Ecclesiasticus li. 23-30 to our Lord's words in St. Matthew xi. 28-30 (pp. 150-4).

It does not follow that the book is one which can be commended

or w
wel
of o
doub
desc
an o
The
by p
certa
It is
foun
ward
'idea
55-6
'exa
but o
tradit
was '
F
which
the '
consi
painf
pity t
impat
mind
of 'd
(p. 10
(p. 11
(p. 11
It
tically
loftine
Divin
not w
God,
ethica
tone o
who is
Essen
'Chris
catech
of one
teachi
rection
faithfu
the go
(p. 32
where
in His

or which we can wish any to read but those who, as we have said, are well grounded in Christian truth. Even as regards the human side of our Lord's life and ministry it is not satisfactory. It suggests doubts as to the truth of some parts of the Gospel history. 'The descent of the Spirit at' our Lord's 'Baptism' is described as, 'if not an objective fact,' 'at least a happy symbol of the truth' (p. 12). The 'presentation of Jesus in the first Gospel' is said to be 'influenced by prophecy going before,' while that 'in the third Gospel is to a certain extent influenced by reverential faith coming after' (p. 26). It is implied that there are ordinarily reasons for doubting a history found only in St. Luke's Gospel (p. 18). The explanations afterwards given do not remove the objectionable character of the word 'idealized' as applied to St. Luke's representation of our Lord (pp. 55-6); and it is regarded as possible that some parts of it are 'exaggerations for a purpose,' indications that 'Luke did not invent, but only at most touched up stories given to his hand by a reliable tradition' (p. 79). It is said to be unimportant whether our Lord was 'physically descended from David' (p. 30).

Further, the view taken of our Lord's humanity is evidently one which is not unmarked by tendencies to heresy. The phrase that in the 'sayings of the hill' 'we see Jesus at His best' (p. 15) is hardly consistent with the attitude of orthodox Christian reverence. It is painful to read of our Lord speaking 'impatiently,' and passing 'from pity to impatience' (p. 98); or of the 'disappointment, bordering on impatience,' which 'was, it is to be feared, a chronic feeling in Christ's mind in reference to the men whom He had chosen' (p. 157); or of 'disappointment' leading to 'a change in the plan of Jesus' (p. 102); or of our Lord making 'an evangelizing experiment' (p. 112); or of His acting 'spontaneously, without calculation' (p. 115).

It is a still more serious feature that our Lord's Godhead is practically ignored. Professor Bruce does indeed speak of 'the Divine loftiness of His character' (p. 251), and say that 'in Him, if He be Divine, the Father came to seek the lost,' so that 'Patripassianism is not wholly a heresy' (p. 205); but he refers to Him as 'a Son of God, if not in the metaphysical sense of theology, at least in the ethical sense of possessing a God-like spirit' (p. 12), and the general tone of the book is not calculated to give the slightest idea that He who is being described is personally the Eternal Son of God, of one Essence with the Father. This feature is strongly marked in the 'Christian Primer,' which forms the last chapter of the book. In a catechism for children, occupying twenty-four pages, and consisting of one hundred and twenty-two questions and answers, there is no teaching that our Lord is God, and the only references to His Resurrection are in the answers, 'He told them that all who serve God faithfully in this world must suffer, that His sufferings would be for the good of the world, and that after His death He would rise again' (p. 329); 'Jesus' 'is' 'now' 'in the house of His Father in Heaven, where He is preparing a place for all who bear His name and walk in His footsteps' (p. 332). It would not be an unnatural inference

that at the least Professor Bruce thinks it of little importance whether his readers and the children taught by the 'Christian Primer' do or do not believe that our Lord Jesus Christ is truly God.

Luther's Primary Works, together with his Shorter and Larger Catechisms. Translated into English. Edited, with Theological and Historical Essays, by HENRY WACE, D.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's, Preacher of Lincoln's Inn, Principal of King's College, London, Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and C. A. BUCHHEIM, Ph.D., Professor of the German Language and Literature in King's College, London. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896.)

THE works of Luther which this volume contains are his *Short Catechism*, *Greater Catechism*, *Address to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation respecting the Reformation of the Christian Estate*, *Concerning Christian Liberty*, *On the Babylonish Captivity of the Church*, and the *Ninety-five Theses*. It is stated in the Preface that the two *Catechisms* have been translated and published in order to show 'the manner in which' 'the principles from which the Reformation started' 'were applied by the great Reformer in the renovation of Faith and Practice in the common life of Christians' (p. v). From this point of view they are of great interest. The subjects treated in the *Short Catechism* are 'the ten commandments,' 'the Creed,' 'the Lord's Prayer,' 'the Sacrament of Holy Baptism,' 'How the simple folk should be taught to confess,' 'the Sacrament of the Altar,' 'the morning blessing,' 'the evening blessing,' 'the Benedicite' and 'Gratias' for meals, and 'the home table' of 'offices and duties.' Those in the *Greater Catechism* are 'the ten commandments,' 'the Creed,' 'the Lord's Prayer,' 'Baptism,' and 'the Sacrament of the Altar.' The *Ninety-five Theses* are the famous propositions which Luther nailed on the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg in 1517. Of the other three treatises the editors say that they

'were all produced in the critical year 1520, when the Reformer appealed at the same moment to the Pope, to the Christian Nobility of his nation, to earnest Christian men, and to Theologians, to promote a real Reform in the Church. Accordingly, the Treatise on Christian Liberty combines with an earnest appeal to the Pope an impressive statement of the cardinal Christian truths in which Luther's whole soul was absorbed, and which he longed to deliver from the obscurity in which they were imprisoned by the prevalent philosophy and theology. On the other hand, in the Address to the Nobility he exposed with tremendous power the practical abuses which prevailed in the Roman Church in Germany; and in the Treatise on the Babylonish Captivity he attacked the spiritual abuses which had grown up, like a huge canker, around the Christian Sacraments. His work in the latter treatise is avowedly somewhat tentative, and his views on some points were afterwards modified; but the main principles on which his reforming movement proceeded are asserted with great clearness and force' (Preface, pp. vii-viii).

The works here translated are thus of great importance, and the publication of them is a service to students both of the per-

189
son
in
by I
have
to th
by I
Libe
Nin
trans
lishe
revis
I
of th
and
of t
weak
not
thou
Chris
in re
An in
subje
way i
' p
mark
with
Chris
Ages
school
garde
intens
dema
thoug
since
of the
race u
the n
rouse
school
to real
large,
The gl
Ages
virtues
Aquin
men fe
more g
pleasur
great p
tation
Infern
terrible
terror a

sonal history of Luther and of the course of religious thought in the sixteenth century. The *Catechisms* have been translated by Miss Buchheim with the assistance of Miss Dora Schmitz, and have been revised by Dr. Wace and Dr. Buchheim; the *Address to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation* has been translated by Dr. Buchheim; and the translation of the treatises on *Christian Liberty* and on *The Babylonish Captivity of the Church* and of the *Ninety-five Theses* is the work of the late Rev. R. S. Grignon. The translations of the *Theses* and of the three longer treatises were published by Mr. Murray in 1883, and have been reprinted after careful revision by Dr. Buchheim and Dr. Wace in the present volume.

Besides the translations there are two valuable essays. The first of these is by Dr. Wace, 'On the Primary Principles of Luther's Life and Teaching.' It is marked by great clearness, accurate knowledge of the subject, and strong grasp of the principles involved. Its weakness, as we cannot but think, is that the learned author does not appear to be sufficiently alive to the limitations of Luther's thought, and that he fails to see the permanent value of some aspects of Christian doctrine to which Luther was opposed, with regard to which in rejecting mediæval corruptions he rejected also Catholic truth. An instance of the great ability with which Dr. Wace handles his subject may be found in his description of the Middle Ages, and the way in which they led up both to Tetzel and to Luther:

'It is by no mere accident of controversy that the *Ninety-five Theses* mark the starting-point of Luther's career as a Reformer. The subject with which they dealt was not only in close connexion with the centre of Christian truth, but it touched the characteristic thought of the Middle Ages. From the beginning to the end, those ages had been a stern school of moral and religious discipline, under what was universally regarded as the Divine authority of the Church. St. Anselm, with his intense apprehension of the Divine righteousness and of its inexorable demands, is at once the noblest and truest type of the great school of thought of which he was the founder. The special mission of the Church since the days of Gregory the Great had been to tame the fierce energies of the new barbarian world, and to bring the wild passions of the Teutonic race under the control of the Christian law. It was the task to which the necessities of the hour seemed to summon the Church, and she roused herself to the effort with magnificent devotion. Monks and schoolmen performed prodigies of self-denial and self-sacrifice, in order to realize in themselves, and to impose as far as possible on the world at large, the laws of perfection which the Church held before their vision. The glorious cathedrals which arose in the best period of the Middle Ages are but the visible types of those splendid structures of ideal virtues which a monk like St. Bernard or a schoolman like St. Thomas Aquinas piled up by laborious thought and painful asceticism. Such men felt themselves at all times surrounded by a spiritual world, at once more glorious in its beauty and more awful in its terrors than either the pleasures or the miseries of this world could adequately represent. The great poet of the Middle Ages affords perhaps the most vivid representation of their character in this respect. The horrible images of the *Inferno*, the keen sufferings of purification in the *Purgatorio*, form the terrible foreground behind which the *Paradiso* rises. Those visions of terror and dread and suffering had stamped themselves on the imagina-

tion of the mediæval world, and lay at the root of the power with which the Church overshadowed it. In their origin they embodied a profound and noble truth. It was a high and Divine conception that the moral and spiritual world with which we are encompassed has greater heights and lower depths than are generally apprehended in the visible experience of this life; and Dante has been felt to be in a unique degree the poet of righteousness. . . . In substance the menaces of the Church appealed to deep convictions of the human conscience, and the mass of men were not prepared to defy them.

'Now it was into this world of spiritual terrors that Luther was born, and he was in an eminent degree the legitimate child of the Middle Ages. . . . Nothing was more certain to him than that Divine justice is inexorable; no conviction was more deeply fixed in his heart than that righteousness is the supreme law of human life. But the more he realized this truth, the more terrible he found it, for it seemed to shut him up in a cruel prison, against the bars of which he beat himself in vain. . . . Such an experience is not a mere revolt against the Middle Ages. In great measure it is but the full realization of their truest teaching. It is Dante intensified, and carried to the inevitable development of his principles.

'But if this be the case, what it meant was that the Middle Ages had brought men to a deadlock. They had led men up to a gate so strait that no human soul could pass through it. . . . The most obvious and easy way out of the difficulty was to modify, by virtue of some dispensing authority, the extreme requirements of Divine justice, and, by a variety of half-unconscious, half-acknowledged devices, to lessen the severity of the strait gate and of the narrow way. Such a power . . . at length . . . led to the hideous abuses of such preaching of indulgences as that of Tetzel. . . . Luther, in the course of his spiritual struggles, had found the true deliverance from what we have ventured to call that deadlock to which the grand vision of Divine righteousness had led him. He realized that the strait gate was impassable by any human virtue; but he had found the solution in the promise of a supernatural deliverance which was offered to faith' (pp. 427-30).

Now, the whole passage from which we have made these lengthy extracts is, in our opinion, marked alike by a want of appreciation of the Sacramental truth which underlay all the distortions of the Middle Ages, and by a lack of recognition of the imperfection of Luther's idea of faith; its very great ability, we think, none can question.

The other essay, entitled 'The Political Course of the Reformation in Germany (1517-1546),' is by Dr. Buchheim. It, too, shows accurate historical knowledge, strong grasp on historical principle, and power of presenting facts in such a way as to make their significance and relations clear. Dr. Buchheim's subject is political, not theological, and it would be very unfair to criticize his essay for mere silence on theological matters. When, however, he speaks of the Confession of Augsburg as having 'contained' 'many concessions to Roman Catholicism' (p. 488), it is right to point out that he does not seem to realize to how great an extent this Confession was due to fear of Protestant extremes; and in his enthusiasm for the Reformation he ascribes to it too exclusively all that since has been good, and does not see clearly enough that in it which was evil. Thus we find him saying:

react
the b
men
reaso
histo
bless

T
essay
modi
into a
with
be of
Luther

Mar
C

THIS
gravin
and c
'Luth
Refor
the m
divisio
Comp
As
history
history
strong
his cha
Th
passag

'M
of their
the enl
zealous
view sh
reason
satisfie
Witten
Protest
the Cat
their sa
and mo
fragmen
the Cou
within t
such po
creeds,
and lan
soul, in

'The Reformation is the source, directly or indirectly, by action or by reaction, of everything great and noble which has taken place from about the beginning of the sixteenth century. Through the Reformation alone men of all creeds have become free and enlightened. And this is the reason why 'not only the theologian, but also the political and literary historian, hail the work of the Reformation as one of the greatest blessings ever bestowed on mankind' (p. 492).

There is, then, reason to fear that the ability of these striking essays may prevent some readers from seeing where they need to be modified or where they ignore considerations which ought to be taken into account. For those who will read them in a critical spirit and with a desire to test their conclusions and points of view they ought to be of great value and to prove a useful supplement to the treatises of Luther with which they are here bound up.

Martin Luther. By GUSTAV FREYTAG. Translated by HENRY E. O. HEINEMANN. (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1897.)

THIS is a well-printed book containing a number of full-page engravings which include various portraits, facsimiles of an indulgence and of Luther's handwriting, and pictures such as Spangenberg's 'Luther's Entrance into Worms' and Kaulbach's 'Age of the Reformation.' We are informed by a note that 'the arrangement of the material, together with the selection of the illustrations and the divisions into chapters, has been made by the Open Court Publishing Company.'

As the book now stands no attempt is made at a complete history of Luther's life or a full estimate of his character or place in history. There are a series of interesting sketches which emphasize strongly his best sides. They say little about the weaker parts of his character or teaching.

The general standpoint of the book may be seen from the passage with which the first chapter opens:

'Many well-meaning men still cherish regret that certain great evils of their old Church led to the great schism of the Reformation. Even the enlightened Catholic still looks upon Luther and Zwingli simply as zealous heretics whose wrath caused ecclesiastical dissensions. Such a view should be abandoned. All Christian denominations have good reason to be grateful to Luther, for to him they owe a purified faith which satisfies the heart and soul and enriches their lives. The heretic of Wittenberg is a reformer for the Catholic quite as much as for the Protestant. Not only because in the struggle with him the teachers of the Catholic Church outgrew their ancient scholasticism and fought for their sacraments with new weapons taken from his language, culture, and moral worth; nor only for the reason that he had shattered into fragments the Church of the Middle Ages, and compelled his enemies in the Council of Trent to erect an apparently new and more solid structure within the old forms and dimensions; but still more because he gave such powerful expression to the common foundation of all Christian creeds, to human bravery, piety, sincerity and heartiness, that in religion and language, in civil order and morality, in the bent of the popular soul, in science and poetry, a great deal of his nature is even now im-

manent in us and shared by all Teutonic races to-day. Some of those things which in his stubborn fights Luther defended against both Reformed and Catholics, have been condemned by the freer intelligence of the present age. His doctrine, wrung from a passionate, high-strung, reverential soul in convulsive struggles, failed, in some not unimportant particulars, to hit the right point; at times he was harsh, unjust, even cruel towards his adversaries; but such things should no longer perplex us, for all the limitations of his nature and culture are overwhelmed by the wealth of bliss which flowed from his great heart into the life of mankind' (pp. 1-2).

The Unveiling of the Eternal Word. By the Right Rev. A. B. WEBB, D.D., Bishop of Grahamstown. (London: Skeffington and Son, 1897.)

THE addresses in this volume were preserved in notes which were taken by some of those daughters in Christ to whom the Bishop was speaking in two retreats at Grahamstown. The subject of 'the great self-disclosure of our Lord as the Lord Jehovah of the Old Testament, coming forth from His eternity on the way to His incarnation, and visiting the children of men,' has been much in Dr. Webb's thoughts for many years (Pref. pp. v-vi),¹ and the devotional mode of his treatment of it may serve a useful purpose in the Church at large when criticism has so greatly emphasized the intellectual aspects of Old Testament study. Through the times of Abraham, 'the espousals in the wilderness,' David, and the Prophets, the reader is taken, after a meditation on 'the interval of silence' (p. 97), to contemplate the Incarnation, and our Lord's manifestation of Himself to St. Paul and to man in this present day. We have not read a book for some time which has so forcibly confirmed us in our belief in the unity of revelation, and in the conviction that the doctrine of the Incarnation is the centre in which all rays of truth meet.

Adrift among the Dead, and other Sermons. By the Rev. A. RITCHIE. Published by the Guild of St. Ignatius. (New York, 1897.)

WE can put into a small compass what we wish to say about this little collection of twelve sermons. Mr. Ritchie has a freshness of treatment which is very attractive, and as he is loyal to the great verities of the Faith he exercises his gift without indulging in any startling novelty. A verse of the 88th Psalm suggests the title of the first sermon, a Psalm on the sadness of which the preacher rightly dwells, although (p. 6) he seems to have overlooked the ray of light which is contained in the words, 'O Lord God of my salvation.' We are glad to find a preacher who goes to the LXX and Vulgate versions for help in the elucidation of difficult verses in the Psalms (pp. 7, 32); and as the Psalter forms such a large part of the Church's words of praise, we welcome excellent attempts to expound the meaning of special passages (pp. 53, 89, 124). Illustrations are

¹ On the Theophanies see Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 51, 8th edit.; Ottley's *Doctrine of the Incarnation*, i. 41; Medd's 'Bampton Lectures' noticed in *The Church Quarterly Review*, No. xxxv. p. 233; Newman's *Sermons*, ii. 36.

wisely used, and at one time a modern poet (p. 9), at another an ancient Father (p. 22), at another the preacher's own pastoral experience (p. 99) is called upon to point a moral. As samples of the variety of subjects on which Mr. Ritchie has something to say which is worthy of attention we may mention biographies (p. 53), Church unity (p. 65), the conciseness of the Gospel narrative (p. 77), the anthropomorphism and the spiritual utterances of the Old Testament (pp. 113, 137).

The Myths of Israel. The Ancient Book of Genesis with Analysis and Explanation of its Composition. By A. K. FISKE. (New York and London: The Macmillan Company, 1897.)

WITH the exception of the common ground of 'sincerity of purpose and a desire to serve the cause of truth' (p. 13) we find ourselves in such total opposition to Mr. Fiske on the subject of the Book of Genesis, that it is hardly worth while to enter into a discussion of the details of his analysis and explanation. Mr. Fiske thinks that 'persistence in the old view of' the 'origin and meaning' of the book of Genesis 'is in danger of sinking it from reverence to derision' (Pref. p. v), that 'the moral tone which pervades' it 'is not high,' and that 'the story is mythical, the product of imagination and race pride' (*ibid.* p. vi). He appears to be quite willing to acknowledge that the book contains a divine element, because he acknowledges a divine element in everything (pp. 11, 12). He is not so ready to acknowledge in others the sincerity which he claims for himself, for he tells us that 'few clergymen venture to tell the truth as many of them know or believe it, because of the unpleasant if not damaging consequences which it is likely to bring upon them' (pp. 8-9). The usual varieties of origin are mentioned in the section on the 'material and composition' of the book (pp. 17-43), with the usual assumption that the Elohist and Jehovist passages imply a difference of authorship. The same style of treatment is applied to 'the tales and myths' in detail (pp. 47-339). No good purpose would be served if we exposed the utter worthlessness of large parts of these pages, and we will only quote one as a sample in which we are told that 'the mythical significance of the story of the first human couple was lost for ages through a perversion of its meaning to serve the ends of a dogma wrought in perfect good faith by the early teachers of Christianity' (p. 56). The volume which contains this sort of 'explanation' of the inspired text fitly closes with an essay on 'the unknown Homer of the Hebrews' (p. 343) which suggests that the author of the sacred history of Israel was 'the mysterious prophet of Mount Carmel . . . whose personality was veiled behind the names of Elijah and Elisha' (p. 355).

Under Shadow of the Mission. A Memory of Santa Barbara. By L. S. MCCHESENEY. (London: Methuen and Co., 1897.)

WE have returned to this book again and again in the hope that we might at last be able to catch hold of some thread which would guide us as to the meaning of the authoress. We do not even now

feel at all sure of our ground, and ask to be forgiven if we have quite missed the drift of the book. If we quote the opening sentence of the prelude our readers will, we trust, sympathize with our efforts. 'The lady says, 'In bringing to the light of day this manuscript which holds our memory of Santa Barbara, from the yellowing leaves dropped phantom eschscholtzias, dim pansies, and loosened rose-petals; and about them lingered still the faint scent of that far-off summer year.' By boldly reading on through many pages of this high-toned sentimental writing, with a desperate determination to understand something, if it be possible to the brain of mortal man, we have arrived at the conclusion, which we mention with some hesitation, that the authoress went to Santa Barbara, a Californian health resort, where she lived under the shadow of the ruins of a Roman Catholic mission during a long convalescence, and in these chapters gives an account, chiefly in dialogues, of the persons who became her friends or acquaintances. All sorts of figurative names are given to them, and this is suitable for people who talk in such gorgeous metaphorical language. What has, however, surprised us is, that the abhorrence with which we always are seized when we encounter a book written in this style, is every now and then almost overcome by some sensible paragraph which we think we understand. If any reader of this review is perplexed and annoyed because we have not after all told him what the book is about, we can assure him that we have produced upon him exactly the effect which we desired, and if he will kindly spend as much time 'under the shadow of the mission' as we have done, we venture to think that he will be as completely puzzled as we have been.

Monasticism Ancient and Modern. By the Rev. F. C. WOODHOUSE, M.A. (London: Gardner, Darton, and Co., 1896.)

MUCH of the history and something of the principles of ancient and modern monasticism are included in these interesting chapters. They are written in a spirit of warm enthusiasm for the good aspects of monastic life, and at first we felt that we must ourselves supply some necessary qualifications to tone down the brightness of the picture. But before he concludes Mr. Woodhouse himself discourses upon 'the corruptions of monasticism, its abuses, decay and suppression' (p. 218), and, on the whole, leaves a very fair and lively impression upon us. The vivid beauty of some of the finer parts of Kingsley's *Hermits* is indeed absent, and the book, though carefully written, lacks some of the special marks of industry which abound in the details of Miss Eckenstein's *Woman under Monasticism*; but it possesses more inner sympathy with the ascetic spirit than either of those books. In the chapters on the theory and principle of his subject (p. 1), and on its growth and work (p. 67), Mr. Woodhouse has collected the testimony of a great many writers who have looked at monasticism from different points of view, and he has enabled us to see a good deal of the advantages and disadvantages of monastic life. Doubtless monasticism has delivered a

189
prot
vital
the
espe
Chur
othe
thes
than
milit
struc
warra
of rei
been
selve
obser
tempt
Creat
Mani
the ig
house
(p. 55
as tha
welcom
monas
tional
matten
House
whene
Church
life and
esting,
Gilbert
Woodh
the on
more g
several
cussion
back to
rently v
extracts
the Egy
the stor
the her
describ
Lord T
excellen
find how

protest for holiness in the midst of wickedness,¹ has kept up the vital enthusiasm of Christianity, has influenced what it has called the secular clergy, has preserved learning partially in the East, but especially in the West, and has been at more than one stage of the Church's career a mighty power on the side of orthodoxy. On the other hand, it has laid itself open to various charges which minimize these good influences. It has been tinged, and sometimes more than tinged, by that impatience of the condition of the Church militant which has marked the Donatist and the Puritan. It has struck many a blow at lawful episcopal authority by making unwarrantable claims of independence on behalf of influential heads of religious houses or widely-reaching religious societies. It has been guilty of exaggerations which have sometimes shown themselves in confusion of means with ends, sometimes in a failure to observe the due proportion of the faith, and sometimes in a contempt for material things which ignores the sovereign power of the Creator over the natural world, and tends, like Gnosticism, either to Manicheanism or to licence. And it has not been always free from the ignorant excesses of distorted anthropomorphism. Mr. Woodhouse has done well to print epitomes of the Rules of St. Basil (p. 55), St. Benedict (p. 76), and St. Francis (p. 115), and such a list as that on p. 162 of the principal persons in a monastery will give welcome information to all but the special student. The chapter on monasticism in Britain (p. 131) tells a tale of the Church's educational work before Parliament began to interest itself in such matters; and it contains many facts of which some members of the House of Commons show themselves to be profoundly ignorant whenever there is an education debate or an attack upon the Church. During this year the descriptions of Anglo-Saxon monastic life and of the abbey of Glastonbury (pp. 151, 167) are specially interesting, and we are glad to see that mention is made of the order of Gilbert of Sempringham, founded in 1148 (p. 159), though Mr. Woodhouse omits to say what we believe to be the case, that it is the only mediæval order of purely English foundation. On the more general subject of the origin of monasticism we also notice several omissions. We should have been pleased to see a little discussion of Mr. Freeman's attempt² to trace Egyptian monasticism back to the devotees mentioned by Philo at Alexandria, who apparently were not Christians, but a body of Jewish monks; and some extracts from the well-known chapter of Socrates on the solitaries of the Egyptian desert and other weird characters would have enlivened the story with several excellent specimens of the rugged humour of the hermits. Nor can the darker side of Eastern hermit life be fully described without reflections upon the struggle which is set forth in Lord Tennyson's *St. Simeon Stylites*, and, we may add, in Kingsley's excellent comments upon it.³ We confess that we are surprised to find how much can be said upon the revival of monasticism in the

¹ See Church's *Life of St. Anselm*, pp. 1-6.

² *Principles of Divine Service*, i. 55.

³ *Hermits*, p. 167.

Church of England, which forms the subject of the last chapter (p. 270). Mr. Woodhouse, indeed, does more here than he professes by his chapter heading to do, and traces the present force of monastic influence in the chief European countries, noticing particularly the noble work of the Christian Brothers in French schools (p. 281). He has compiled lists of the chief religious societies for men and women which exist among us; the resolutions of Convocation and diocesan conferences on the subject of brotherhoods are printed, and particulars are given of the communities of women in the United States (p. 328). The great work of hope which has been begun at St. Saviour's, Southwark, forms a practical response to much of the desire which Mr. Woodhouse expresses, and we have much pleasure in recommending his book to all who wish to have an account of monastic institutions for handy reference.

His Divine Majesty; or, The Living God. By W. HUMPHREY, S.J. (London: Thomas Baker, 1897.)

ST. IGNATIUS LOYOLA uses the phrase which gives the title to this book no fewer than twenty-four times in his *Short Spiritual Exercises*. The influence of that remarkable work is not to be measured even by reflecting that it has moulded the inner lives of all the members of the Society of Jesus. In the intercourse with God to which St. Ignatius invites the soul there is no cloud interposed between the creature and the Object of his faith and love. It was this peculiar fulness of satisfying the wants of man for communion with his God which gave the *Spiritual Exercises* an important place in the history of Cardinal Newman's religious opinions between 1841 and 1845.¹ It is because this want belongs to man *generaliter* that the Jesuit Fathers from time to time base a book for the general public upon the pregnant writings of their founder, as Father Clarke did a short time ago when he issued *The Science of Spiritual Life*, and as Father Humphrey has now done by writing upon the Divine Majesty of the living God. The subject, it is justly said, is of interest to all who believe in a personal God, and even to those who are only as yet seeking Him (Pref. p. vii). In this very wide circle of readers there are many who cannot undertake to study the whole of a connected and necessarily abstruse series of arguments. They will find that Father Humphrey has provided them with a convenient book of reference, which will enable them to ascertain the meaning of many of the words which are used in connexion with the doctrine of the being of Almighty God, without obliging them to follow the course of his treatise. By glancing at the copious table of contents it will be possible at once to turn to the passages which explain such words as Essence, Attributes, Substance, Being, Nature, Person, Eternal, Immense, Incomprehensible, Natural, Supernatural, and Preternatural. Father Humphrey of course fortifies himself by the quotation of the constitution *Dei Filius*, which expresses the teaching of the Vatican Council 'concerning God, the Creator of all things,'

¹ *Apologia pro Vita sua*, p. 196 (ed. 1887). Cf. Church's *Occasional Papers*, i. 238.

in ve
natu
this i
(p. 5
essen
man's
prepa
the a
the p
338).
Reve
the s
remi
The
other
that
113)
late M
welco
the st
Creat
to dis

The
B
on
A

PROFE
patrio
used
that th
deeper
The su
for whe
high ro
neither
therefo
the cou
salient
study n
with all
Colum
Cadroe
lecture,
the glo

¹ Fu
referenc
Pusey's
Advent
² Bis

in very noble language (Pref. pp. viii-ix). Man's knowledge of God naturally forms the subject of the opening chapters (pp. 1, 42), and this is followed by a treatment of the essence and attributes of God (p. 57), and the absolute and negative properties of the divine essence (pp. 74, 119). God's knowledge and His sincere will of man's salvation are then considered (pp. 131, 184), and the way is prepared for the contemplation of God as the one Creator (p. 205), the author alike of nature (p. 258), the supernatural (p. 283), and the paradise in which He was pleased to place our first parents (p. 338). The concluding chapter places before us the teaching of Revelation upon the inner life of God (p. 347), and contains, upon the subject of the Holy Trinity, some valuable paragraphs, which remind us of the closing passages of Bishop Ullathorne's treatise on *The Endowments of Man*.¹ We should be glad to refer to many other striking parts of the book, but we must be content with saying that Father Humphrey's remarks on the notion of the beautiful (p. 113) would have delighted such a keen and competent critic as the late Mr. St. John Tyrwhitt, that the chapter on Paradise will be welcomed by those who have studied Bishop Bull's disquisition on the state of man before the Fall,² and that the chapter on the one Creator contains many valuable arguments for those whose duty it is to dissipate various modern errors upon the origin of visible things.

The Influence of the Scottish Church in Christendom. Being the Baird Lecture for 1895. By HENRY COWAN, D.D., Professor of Church History in the University of Aberdeen. (London: A. and C. Black, 1896.)

PROFESSOR COWAN makes an observation upon the religious and patriotic aims of Mr. Baird's bequest which deserves to be widely used concerning similar endowments. He tells us (Pref. p. viii) that those who give money to the Church and ministers may with deeper truth be said to give Church and ministry to the people. The subject which is indicated by the title is naturally a wide one; for when a Scotchman sees a noble prospect before him, and takes the high road to England or to any other country of the earth, he leaves neither his nationality nor his religion behind him. Dr. Cowan, therefore, can only skim lightly over such a large field of inquiry in the course of six lectures, though he has singled out a good many salient points, and has shown in his notes (pp. 202-84) where further study may be advantageously pursued. The Early Scottish Church, with all the glories which surround the names of SS. Ninian, Patrick, Columba, Columban, Aidan, and the less-known but influential St. Cadroe, has to be compressed into one short and introductory lecture, and part of this, in a delightfully Scotch way, is devoted to the glorification of celebrated Scotchmen in the eighteenth and

¹ Further annotations upon these excellent paragraphs would include references to the fine language of Tertullian against Praxeas, chap. ii.; Pusey's *Minor Prophets*, p. 610; Liddon, *University Sermons*, ii. 352; *Advent Sermons*, i. 288-91.

² Bishop Bull's *English Theological Works*, p. 445.

nineteenth centuries. Dr. Cowan has not room enough to insert the very large qualifications which are required to balance his remark that the chief share in the honour of having made the Saxons of England a Christian nation pertains not to Rome but to Iona (p. 9), and of course he falls a prey to the well-known delusive epigram on that subject (p. 12). After this Dr. Cowan passes without a word, again characteristically, from the tenth to the sixteenth century. The Scottish Reformed Church was too busy with its Reformation settlement to be conspicuous for missionary enterprise during the first two centuries of its life; and also the commerce and colonization of that period was very largely in the hands of Roman Catholic countries which would not be favourable to Protestant missions. A considerable section of Dr. Cowan's second lecture is therefore devoted to the aspirations and the scattered if earnest efforts of early Presbyterianism to discharge one of the fundamental duties of the Gospel (p. 28). It is only when he comes to more modern times, well into the eighteenth century, that he is able to speak with more satisfaction, and to dwell upon the record of a truly great missionary influence in the life of David Livingstone (pp. 54-60). We will not notice the details of the two lectures in which the influence of the Scottish Church is traced in North America and in British Colonies or on the Continent of Europe, or in that part of another lecture which deals with Ireland (pp. 85, 103, 132), though we may commend the useful epitome of the history which they contain. It will be likely to interest a wider circle of our readers if we refer to Dr. Cowan's treatment of the influence of the Scottish Church in England (p. 61), and its relation to political liberty and spiritual independence (p. 167). There are many matters of lasting importance to the Church of England which fall under these heads. The ministry and influence of Knox, the history of the Solemn League and Covenant, the relation of Scottish Presbyterianism to English Methodism, the great struggle of the seventeenth century against Anglicizing policy and tyrannical intrusion, are topics on which Dr. Cowan says as much as the exigencies of space allow. We hope that the value of the Notes will be recognized, and no one can test the Index without acknowledging that it facilitates the investigation of many interesting points.

Christ's Temptation and ours. The Baldwin Lectures, 1896. By the Right Rev. A. C. A. HALL, D.D., Bishop of Vermont. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897.)

IN this course of lectures on the necessity of temptation for man, its possibility for our Incarnate Lord, the actual account of it as it historically took place in His life, and its sequel and renewal in the Passion, there are many features which deserve the attention of the student of theology and of the practical preacher, especially of the preacher who has to address himself to men. If we take the last point first we notice much which is likely to win the respect and to elevate the lives of men whose religion has to be tried by perpetual

cont
is th
ques
further
the p
(pp.
nifica
and j
in wh
when
which
the s
to sn
that
are li
But
ourse
to m
point
requir
Faith
keeps
Catho
treasu
life, a
super
reason
notes,
Canon
also to
In
must
which
man w
(p. 9).
really
explain
it is pl
remark
is the
Dr. H
must v
works,
will.
myster

¹ T
the wel
the Sev
² S
Comm

contact with 'the world' in the Johannine sense of that term. Such is the mode in which Dr. Hall deals with the treatment of perplexing questions when they arise. They are to be faced, not shirked; further light is to be looked for until the truth which is enshrined in the problem is gained, with its light and strength and inspiration (pp. 7-8). Practical lessons are noted as flowing from the significance of the time of our Lord's temptation, just after His baptism, and just before His public ministry (pp. 36-7). The various ways in which man is tempted to get 'bread,' all that seems most necessary, when God has not made a right way possible, are described in language which will lay many a man's heart bare to himself (pp. 76-80). It is the same with regard to the temptations to presumption (p. 104) and to snatch at power in the wrong way (p. 124). And we will add also that there are many vivid phrases and sayings in the lectures which are likely to sink deep into the mind—for example, on pp. 38, 56. But we only summarize such practical features in order to leave ourselves room to enlarge on what is in the long run likely to lead to most practical results, the value of the lectures from a theological point of view. The Temptation is only second to the Atonement in requiring all the aid of the Church's authoritative expression of the Faith to keep the balance of theological teaching true. Dr. Hall keeps his eye steadily fixed on those great defensive formulas of Catholic doctrine, and the result is that his book places the old treasure in its proper relation towards the new conditions of modern life, and should be studied by all who see in Christian dogma a supernatural power for the production of goodness. For practical reasons Dr. Hall has referred chiefly to writers of a recent date in notes, and specially acknowledges his obligations to Dr. Wace and Canon Hutchings (pref. p. x). But we are glad to see references also to older works,¹ though they might have been more numerous.

In the front of the topics which will interest the theologian we must place what is indeed an anthropological question, but one which concerns man in his relation to his Creator, in whose image man was made—the question of the necessity of temptation for man (p. 9). When Dr. Hall says that 'we men and women could not be really good, unless it were possible for us to be bad' (*ibid.*), he explains himself in a manner which wins our cautious assent. But it is plain that a good many qualifications must be appended to the remark. We must observe that the goodness of God Himself, who is the source of all created goodness, is to be excluded, and by Dr. Hall's words is excluded from the scope of the affirmation. Nor must we forget that goodness was ascribed by the Creator to all His works, and not only to those creatures who were endowed with free-will. To this we will only add that we know very little about the mysterious subject of the probation of the angels² (p. 11). Dr. Hall

¹ To Dr. Mill's *Five Sermons on the Temptation* on pp. 32, 114; to the well-known Note C in Dr. Liddon's *Bampton Lectures* on p. 74; to the Seven Sermons of Bishop Andrewes upon the Temptation on p. 100.

² See, however, St. Athanasius, *Ad Afros*, c. 7; St. Vincent, *Commonitorium*, §§ 21-2 (ch. viii. ed. Oxford, 1837 and 1841);

fully recognizes that the Gospel narrative of the Temptation of our Lord is the record of a real experience in the life of one who was truly divine and truly human, and he very properly opens the subject of the possibility of temptation for our Lord with some accurate paragraphs on the two natures of the one Person of Christ (pp. 15-23). The remarks on our Lord's 'moral progress' traverse that very delicate subject with commendable care. It is not for a moment to say that our Lord was subject to moral change in the Arian sense, to say that He advanced 'from goodness of one kind to goodness of a different and higher kind, from a perfection of flawlessness and innocence to a perfection of ripened maturity'—from Bethlehem, in fact, to Calvary¹ (pp. 19, 20). Another equally delicate matter is touched upon in a passage which deals with the question whether our Lord lived His human life, wrought His works, fought His battles, and won His victory 'by the inherent power which belonged to Him as the second Person of the blessed Trinity,' or 'by the sanctifying and enabling power of the Holy Spirit of God which rested upon His manhood'² (p. 22).

We should not feel able ourselves to go as far as Dr. Hall has done in the direction of this 'quiescence' of the Person of the Word. All through it was 'He' who lived, and wrought, and won, and was content to submit to human limitations, and this conscious personal agency must not be ignored. In quoting from the *Dream of Gerontius* Dr. Hall repeats the popular reading of 'the' for 'their' in the line 'Should strive afresh against *their* foe'—that is, the foe of flesh and blood³ (p. 23). On the personality of the tempter (p. 39) Dr. Hall has written concisely, and expressed himself very satisfactorily. He might have added more to his notes here with advantage. That our Lord could have yielded to temptation is inconceivable to Dr. Hall, as we suppose it must be to everyone who holds the full Nicene faith; but it is no good to say that the question 'seems needless' (p. 74) when it is bound to suggest itself

St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, 1^a, quest. 62, art. 8, who quotes St. Augustine as saying that the angels have that kind of nature which cannot sin. He supports this and answers the objections: (1) that as created beings they are liable to fall; (2) that they have free-will; (3) that they have that kind of rationalness which leads them to balance one thing against another, by saying that they were created for the purpose of serving God, and since they see Him as He is their will always tends to perform His will, and their free-will is more perfectly free, because they cannot sin, than ours is, because we can sin. Comp. Hooker, *Ecc. Pol.* i. 4, 3; Trench, *Studies in the Gospels*, p. 29; Boswell's *Johnson*, ii. 459 (ed. Napier); Butler's *Analogy*, pt. i. ch. v.; Bishop Wilberforce's *Sermons*, p. 132.

¹ St. Athanasius, *Orations against the Arians*, iii. 28; and see under the word *προκοπή* in the index of the *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius* (ed. Oxford 1853), p. 596.

² Hooker, *Ecc. Pol.* v. 54, 6, where he quotes St. Irenæus's saying, *ἡσυχάζοντος μὲν τοῦ λόγου ἐν τῷ περὶ πάσθαις* . . .

³ Noticed in the *Church Quarterly Review* for April 1894, No. 35, p. 94.

at some stage of the inquiry, and it would have been better to show, as was once so admirably done by a writer in these pages, how our Lord's impeccability bears upon the force of His example.¹ When the theological ground has thus been carefully laid out Dr. Hall is able to drive home his practical lessons with great power, and we may express a hope that these lectures will assist many preachers in the coming Lent to be true both to the supreme verities of the Faith and to the cravings of the human heart for the sympathy of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Genesis of the Social Conscience. By Professor H. S. NASH. (New York and London : The Macmillan Company, 1897.)

No one need attempt to read this book who is not prepared to devote the most patient attention to the well-nigh unfathomable obscurity of the author's style, and to exercise what Professor Nash calls 'the geologist's time-sense' (p. 2). His aim, which will interest all who believe that no man liveth to himself, is to show that the social question strikes its roots into the soil of the civilization which surrounded the Mediterranean, a gathering point of the ancient and a cradle of the modern world. The Professor, who is imbued with the spirit of the modern and far western world, makes a philosophical survey of a restricted area of history. He sums up under fifteen short heads (pp. 2-5) the main points which he desires to make good. Greece and Rome defined the individual man, and Christianity provided the power to drive the meaning of the definition home. If we understand the author's drift aright, he has buried in the depths of incomprehensible language the old thought that the Personality of God both explains and requires the personality of man, and carries with it, if duly considered, just conceptions of man's duty to his God and to his neighbour, circling round such words as 'freedom' and 'the Kingdom of God.' But why should we toil after this in deep pits of thought when we can obtain it by repeating the Church Catechism?

Theodore and Wilfrith. Lectures delivered in St. Paul's in December 1896. By the Right Rev. G. F. BROWNE, D.D., D.C.L. (London : S.P.C.K., 1897.)

THIS is the last of a series of five courses of lectures on the earliest history of the Church of England which the Bishop of Bristol delivered as Canon of St. Paul's, in accordance with an arrangement made with the late Archbishop of Canterbury. In their published form the lectures give to historical students a new and handy survey of a very interesting period. Twenty-four excellent illustrations are included in the present volume, although it must be said that their immediate connexion with the two names of the title is not always obvious. This is, however, because the text travels somewhat widely over the period, and there is, indeed, a good deal of material that can fairly be called padding, as in the too-long account of the Monothelite

¹ Noticed in the *Church Quarterly Review* for July 1883.

heresy on pp. 73, 164. But it may be justly said that Theodore and Wilfrid were two such great men that almost every movement of their time and country was marked by their action upon it. It was a period when the Church of the English rose up into remarkable vigour and healthy consciousness of Christian power and freedom, and when the Bishops of Rome made strenuous efforts to assert their jurisdiction over the young spiritual kingdom. We are heartily in accord with Bishop Browne as a matter of principle when he shows how these Papal claims, on repeated occasions, were uncompromisingly rejected on the part of the English Church. But we regret his controversial tone exceedingly, and we are sure that it will not win for his arguments and facts the recognition of strength and truth which they deserve. Such books as Dr. Littledale's *Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome* on the one hand, and Cobbett's *History of the Protestant Reformation* on the other hand, no doubt strike the exact tone which appeals to certain minds. But in a Bishop and a University Professor we look for a more courteous and urbane treatment of opponents than we find in the volume before us.¹ We are sorry to say that on another point Bishop Browne offends our sense of literary fitness. There are certain standard authors on the history of the early English Church whose labours in this field of study have won for them the universal respect of scholars, and whose names and works naturally occur to everyone in connexion with the history of Theodore and Wilfrid. When no mention of them, and no references whatever to their works, occur throughout Bishop Browne's book, we can only suppose that the omission was intentional, and this is greatly to be deplored. The author refers to his own previous books repeatedly, both in this and in other series of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. No doubt these books are cheap and handy works of reference, and on certain points it was desirable to correct 'a very unnecessary blunder' in an earlier work of the author (p. 160). But some amount of modesty in self-advertisement is necessary at all times, and particularly when a writer wishes to say that the Popes 'bore witness manfully to themselves' (p. 143). We do not much care to argue about the spelling of names, but 'Wilfrith' strikes us as being a little pedantic in form, because those standard authors to whom we have alluded have made us familiar with the form of Wilfrid. 'Pompfully' (p. 79) is a new word to us, though an expressive one. We like to see the Bishop speaking up for his 'great school of York' (p. 181), but we think that there is more to be said than he says for the Canterbury school.² Our final impression of the lectures is that they will interest the archæologist more than the lover of the living Church, the student of the architecture of the old buildings more than the man who realizes that he is a member of the same body as those who worshipped in them.

¹ We must also add that we regret the way in which Bishop Browne speaks of St. Augustine and St. Paulinus in an article in the *National Church*, June 1897, now reprinted as a S.P.C.K. leaflet, No. 2502.

² See a special article in the *Times* of Sept. 7, 1897.

1. *The O*
for
T. a
2. *A H*
A. C
1897

THESE t
common
plan is o
historical
from doc
of long
readers w
who are,
material
bulk and
which are
points of
same chr
introduc
section of
with wh
Mr. Forr
ment, the
with spec
sider it v
talks abo
phrases, f
means an
imperil th
humanity
conscious
testably o
Him by a
eternal on
and the n
to men as
beside M
the media
circle for
sidered as
and the C
continuity
entrance
of existen
which Hi
Christian
stolic an
Kenotic t
work, the

1. *The Christ of History and of Experience.* Being the Ker Lectures for 1897. By the Rev. D. W. FORREST, M.A. (Edinburgh : T. and T. Clark, 1897.)
2. *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age.* By Professor A. C. MCGIFFERT, Ph.D., D.D. (Edinburgh : T. and T. Clark, 1897.)

THESE two books, differing widely in many respects, have certain common features which lead us to put them side by side. Mr. Forrest's plan is chiefly arranged upon doctrinal, and Dr. McGiffert's upon historical lines, but each writer naturally illustrates many points both from doctrine and from history. Both the books contain the results of long studious labour, and both can be recommended only to readers who know very clearly what the faith of the Church is, and who are, therefore, able to separate the large quantity of very excellent material in both volumes from those parts of them, also large in bulk and in importance, which must be plainly called unsound, and which are the outcome of the authors' Presbyterian and Unitarian points of view respectively. The two books only in part cover the same chronological period, for Dr. McGiffert, after a very slight introductory chapter, which may be said to be parallel to Mr. Forrest's section on 'The Christ of History,' begins where the Gospels end with what Mr. Forrest calls 'the Christ of experience.' It is Mr. Forrest's purpose to discuss, by a gradual and cumulative argument, the relations between the historical and spiritual in Christianity, with special reference to their alleged incongruity. We always consider it very necessary to read any author with extreme caution who talks about our Lord's self-consciousness, and employs similar phrases, for we have found in most cases, and Mr. Forrest's is by no means an exception to the rule, that such writers often appear to imperil the truth of the Incarnation, in their efforts to give our Lord's humanity its due place. Mr. Forrest starts with this word self-consciousness, however, and observes that in our Lord it was uncontestedly of such a character as makes it impossible to account for Him by any theory of normal development, and that it implies His eternal or transcendent Sonship. He attempts to trace its growth, and the method which our Lord adopted in His self-manifestation to men as the Incarnate Son, showing that Teaching took its place beside Miracles and the influence of His personal presence as one of the media of this manifestation, and that the Twelve formed a special circle for the reception of this revelation. The Resurrection is considered as the transition point from the historical to the spiritual, and the Christophanies are declared to verify the persistency and continuity of our Lord's life after death, its transformation, and the entrance of His total personality into a higher and permanent mode of existence. The view of our Lord's person and of the Godhead to which His earthly life, as interpreted by the Resurrection and by Christian experience, inevitably leads, involves a discussion of Apostolic and conciliar Christology, and of what are called 'modern Kenotic theories.' The objective element in our Lord's redemptive work, the conditions of realizing the new life in Christ, a review of

the harmonious coexistence of the historical and spiritual elements in the Christian faith, and an inquiry how far faith in Christ is necessarily conscious,¹ conclude a valuable exposition of 'the reasonableness of that faith which sees in a historic personality the Incarnation of the Eternal Son,' a 'special interposition of the Eternal in time,' the beneficent power of which human thought is much more likely to limit than exaggerate (pp. 5-7, 379). Among the points which impair the value of Mr. Forrest's work in our eyes are his Kenotic Christology (pp. 93, 194-5, 197, 203), his view of the formula of Chalcedon (p. 194), and his account of the New Testament view of the Church (pp. 282-8). The notes contain many valuable extracts (pp. 381-471), and the index is full, but deficiencies of type occur on pp. xiii, 349. We are much less favourably impressed by Dr. McGiffert's work, though it consists of nearly seven hundred closely-packed pages. In these days we do not make any plea of præscription,² as Tertullian would have done, or urge reasons why anyone shall not take our Scriptures and make what comment upon them he pleases. But we may at least say that a writer who approaches the Apostolic age from a Unitarian standpoint, and who includes the death of our Lord, but not His resurrection, in his chronological table (p. 680), can hardly be expected to penetrate very deeply into the subject, or to explain to others the great motive forces of Christianity when the life and source of all is not recognized. Dr. McGiffert finds himself in general agreement with Harnack in the chronology of St. Paul's life, in the interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the general estimate of the Pastoral Epistles, in the conviction that the second Epistle of St. Peter is the only really pseudonymous work in the New Testament, and in the treatment of the Acts of the Apostles as based in the main upon trustworthy sources. But he differs from Harnack upon the North Galatian theory, the second imprisonment of St. Paul, and the Ephesian residence of St. John. The origin of Christianity and its primitive Jewish form are considered in the first two chapters (pp. 1-112), the Christianity and work of St. Paul occupy the heart of the book (pp. 113-439), and the Christianity and development of the Church at large form the contents of the two concluding chapters (pp. 440-end). But we cannot honestly say that we should direct any young student either to Mr. Forrest or to Dr. McGiffert for information upon dogma or history. The positive contributions of their works may be found elsewhere, without the disadvantages under which their merits labour from their deficiencies or their errors.³

¹ Comp. Dean Church, *Human Life and its Conditions*, p. 94; and Shorthouse, *Sir Percival*, p. 259.

² *Liber de Præscriptionibus adversus Hæreticos*.

³ We should like to mention two books which are in our minds in addition to other well-known standard works. One is *The Christ of History*, by Dr. John Young (4th edit., Strahan, London, 1868), which Dr. Liddon used to recommend, and the other is Professor Blunt's better known *History of the Christian Church during the First Three Centuries* (3rd edit., Murray, London, 1861).

SOBE
Hen
and
gene
Chur
the C
Chris
Conf
study
illogi
his b
these
cours
kind,
in Ce
St. C
rema
cise i
to Pa
He e
Augu
quest
The
Engl
Chur
of Be
perma
Roma
delive
certai
W
Hens
livery
the m
of a g
in W
Chris
209, 2
which
some
this li
to ign
secula
found
title o
that w
in the

Light and Leaven. By the Rev. H. H. HENSON, M.A. (London: Methuen, 1897.)

SOBER Churchmen have often and very justly deplored many of Mr. Henson's public utterances, but there is no doubt about his ability, and he gives evidence of it in these historical and social sermons to general congregations. A sermon on the importance of the study of Church history (p. 25) opens a series of discourses on the planting of the Church in Britain, St. Patrick, Celtic Christianity, St. Columba, Christendom in the sixth century, St. Augustine, St. Edward the Confessor, St. Thomas à Becket, and other topics. To neglect the study of Church history, says Mr. Henson in his forcible way, is illogical, discreditable, and spiritually perilous (p. 30), and he does his best to show why he thinks so, and to engage the interest of, in these matters, uneducated hearers. Minute historical discussions of course are neither possible nor desirable in sermons of a general kind, but Mr. Henson gives his reasons for believing in the existence of St. Patrick (p. 52), for accepting the maintenance of episcopacy in Celtic Christianity (pp. 67-8, note), for thinking that the death of St. Columba in the year of Ethelbert's baptism 'is one of the most remarkable coincidences in history' (p. 85), and enables us to exercise in the proper way our 'faculty of historic imagination' in regard to Papal power (p. 87) and Christianity (p. 110) in the sixth century. He estimates with 'great force and justice the true position of St. Augustine (p. 108), and draws attention to the 'grave and difficult questions' which beset all students of ecclesiastical history (p. 123). The work of St. Edward the Confessor, who hallowed the throne of England as St. Louis hallowed that of France, and the conditions of Church life and polity in the twelfth century as set forth in the history of Becket (pp. 135, 147), are reviewed in addresses which deserve permanent preservation. It should be added that the activity of Roman Catholic work in the neighbourhood in which Mr. Henson delivered some of his sermons led him to pay special attention to certain controversial points.

We confess that we are less interested in the social part of Mr. Henson's book, though he gives a vivid account (p. 14) of the delivery of a sermon to working men, which is one of five discourses to the men of Barking. The other sermons on social subjects are two of a general character preached in the chapel of Lincoln's Inn and in Westminster Abbey (pp. 165, 178), and three on the bearing of Christianity upon social relationships, childhood, and slavery (pp. 209, 222, 236). We have no wish to restrict in any way the place which Christian principles ought to occupy in social life, but we see some indications of a tendency to plunge the Church into affairs of this life to the neglect of the things of the life to come—in a word, to ignore the supernatural, and to confuse things sacred and things secular. Mr. Henson is alive to this danger (pp. 202-4), and has found himself in collision with those who take to themselves the title of Christian Socialists on important matters. It is not desirable that we should discuss the principles of the Christian Social Union in the course of a comment upon one part of a volume of sermons,

but we can frankly say that we sympathize with Mr. Henson's vigorous criticisms of some of the methods and utterances of the Union (pp. 201, 208, 325). The attempt of the Union to carry out its programme involves, says Mr. Henson in an appendix upon exclusive dealing, 'an unwarrantable interference with individual liberty, a large neglect of clerical duty, a further lowering of the already low standard of clerical learning, a considerable impetus to the forces (already too strong) of social coercion,' and 'much hypocrisy' (p. 329). We have seen in our day attempts made, with occasional success, on the part of the Church to settle industrial disputes, but some social enthusiasts have been too ready to shut their eyes to the harm done by the interference of those who are not well acquainted with the practical aspects of business.¹

The Secret History of the Oxford Movement. By WALTER WALSH. (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1897.)

Few words are needed to describe this book and our opinion of its value. Mr. Walsh is very much in earnest, and his view of the Oxford Movement and the numerous effects of its principles is that of Mr. Kensit or the more extreme members of the Church Association. He holds Rome in primary abhorrence, and as tending in a secret Jesuitical way to Popery in its viler forms he considers it to be his duty to expose Keble and Pusey and their friends, together with the Society of the Holy Cross, the Order of Corporate Reunion, Sisterhoods, the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, and some other 'Ritualistic Societies.' Many living persons are included in Mr. Walsh's condemnation, and among them are the Archbishop of Canterbury, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Halifax, and Canons Body, Bodington, and Carter. What Mr. Walsh means by his epithet 'secret' is that he has got hold of the intercession papers of some devotional societies, the private minutes and records of debates of various meetings of some other societies named above, and has mixed up his materials with a great horror of the confessional. Mr. Walsh does not seem to be aware that those whom he calls Ritualists can condemn immorality, or Popery, or dishonesty, or that they can possibly possess any redeeming characteristics. He regards them and all their works with unqualified detestation. On pp. 76 and 132 erroneous statements are made about Father Puller.

The Mysteries, Pagan and Christian. Being the Hulsean Lectures for 1896-7. By the Rev. S. CHEETHAM, D.D., F.S.A. (London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1897.)

THE mysteries of nature and of grace are so numerous, and they touch our natural and our supernatural life at so many points, that a complete account of them would require an encyclopædia. Even the restricted technical meaning of the term covers so large a subject that no author can be expected to exhaust it, and it is difficult to know how far to go when once we begin to treat of the principle, which indeed is the principle of the Incarnation, that God employs

¹ See a leading article in the *Times*, December 15, 1897.

His
child
ment
confi
or e
some
deriv
reaso
denc
in a
was
gene
were
a ma
them
there
truth
show
Nam
Him

N
graph
best
critic
Seed
Myst
rist.
is tha
and s
bette

'N
supre
books
cours
congu
races

'V
gone.
gild t
and b
part o
and c
third
Pagan
strong

i. 51,
72;
Nativ
1607;
Univ

His own created *media* for conveying supernatural grace to His children. Even a full discussion of the words *μυστήριον* and *sacramentum* involves many far-reaching points.¹ But Dr. Cheetham has confined himself to an endeavour to remove certain misconceptions or errors which have surrounded the subject. The reluctance of some to believe that Christianity, as it actually exists in the world, derived anything from surrounding paganism is 'not altogether reasonable' (pref. p. xiv), although others may have pressed the evidence too far (pref. p. xv). The Church, as a society that engaged in a worship that was confined neither to domestic nor civic affairs, was necessarily a mystery in the old sense of the word. If its general teaching was perfectly public and open, its most sacred rites were very properly concealed from the gaze of the profane. It was a mark of the primitive Church that the secret of the Lord was among them that feared Him, that pearls were not cast before swine, that there was a right sort of reserve in the communication of religious truth in the Kingdom of Him who taught by parables, who did not show Himself openly to the people after His resurrection, whose Name is Wonderful, and whose written Name 'no one knew but He Himself.'

Not the least useful part of Dr. Cheetham's work is the bibliographical information of the preface, which directs the reader to the best sources of knowledge, and offers him the guidance of short criticisms upon them. The lectures themselves are entitled 'The Seed and its Growth,' 'The Rise of Mysteries,' 'The Secret of the Mysteries and of the Church,' and 'Baptism and the Holy Eucharist.' The broad fact which is left with us after reading the lectures is that Christianity has life and grace in it, while the old mysteries and system of paganism had not. We cannot illustrate this theme better than by two quotations from the first and fourth lectures.

'Neither Epictetus nor even Marcus Aurelius, armed as he was with supreme power, has done more than provide edifying and interesting books for a few students, while Christ and His disciples, starting on their course in poverty and weakness, from an obscure corner, have in fact conquered the most powerful, the most productive, the most progressive races of the world' (p. 29).

'Whatever may have been their influence, the ancient mysteries are gone. They made their attempt, not probably a wholly vain attempt, to gild the life of man by the gleams of hope of a life to come, better, purer, and brighter than that which now we lead. But they were essentially a part of the old paganism, and as the antique culture died away the rites and customs which it brought forth faded and vanished also. In the third and fourth centuries after Christ we see it in its death-throes. Paganism is smitten with a senile decay, while youthful Christianity is strong with a God-given strength. Before the dayspring from on high

¹ See Bright, *St. Leo*, p. 136, note 8, 2nd edition; Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, i. 51, and on Col. i. 26; Schouppe, *Elementa Theologiae Dogmaticae*, i. 72; Newman, *Paroch. Sermon*. ii. 211; Andrewes, *Sermons on the Nativity*, the sermon on 1 St. Tim. iii. 16, preached on December 25, 1607; Oxenham, *Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement*, p. 16; Liddon, *Univ. Sermon*. i. 169, 272, 2nd edition; cf. *μυστήριον* in Phil. iv. 12.

the torches of the mystic rite pale their ineffectual fires. The darkness is passing away, and the true light already shineth. Earth-born clouds still hang round the Sun of Righteousness; clouds even in our own land where Christ has been preached for many generations; clouds darker still in the lands where the very name of Christ is unknown; yet we know that the dawn has begun; we know that the dayspring from on high hath visited us; and we doubt not that it will shine more and more unto the perfect day' (pp. 126-7).

We will only add that many Christian words and practices are illustrated in the course of the lectures, such words as *φωτισμός* and *σφραγίς* (p. 75), *σύμβολον* (p. 106), and possibly *δίπτυχα* (p. 117), such different matters as the representation of the figure of the Good Shepherd (p. 20), the observance of Rogation Days (p. 21), and the use of Lights (p. 107). The unsatisfying results of pagan initiations are contrasted with the fruitful truths of Christianity (pp. 66-7), and an apposite warning is given, which Dr. Hatch would have done well to bear in mind, that our concern is 'with words and not things' in all these matters (p. 74).

The Bearing of the Theory of Evolution on Christian Doctrine. By the Rev. J. A. BETTS. (London: S. P. C. K., 1897.)

WE can quickly dispose of this feeble *brochure*. Mr. Betts does not seem to understand what Evolution really is. He thinks it consists in the fact that the processes of nature are *gradual* as opposed to sudden creations or cataclysms. But that is a mistake. It is a matter of indifference in view of Christian faith whether the one mode or the other be supposed to prevail, and the Christian may well leave it to be determined by science.

The essence of Evolution lies in the reference of everything to natural law; in the entire exclusion from nature of the action of a supreme intelligent and moral Being, such as the Christian believes God to be. If the action of such a Being is admitted, whether that action is conceived as immanent in nature, or above nature, or both, it is no longer Evolution, *i.e.* nature evolving itself in accordance with its inherent laws; it is the subjection of nature to a Supreme Power, the unfolding, not of natural processes, but of the purposes of that Power.

Hence in the application of Evolution to the Old Testament by the school of Wellhausen not only miracles and prophecy are extruded, but everything which can properly be called a revelation. The action of God is completely set aside, and the religion of Israel is viewed as the natural product of the Israelitish mind. It is true that Professor Driver and others of a like mind do not go so far, at least *in words*, but, alas! it is easy to see that the fundamental principle of Evolution, the reference of everything to natural law, underlies their whole work; and in the result they will probably be more dangerous to Christian faith than the more outspoken followers of Wellhausen. The same influence is seen also in the Kenotic theory. It is an attempt in a new way to get rid of the Divine in Christ, so that His life may be brought wholly within the compass of natural law.

It
Prin
whole
a Bei
Intell
sine
Spenc
Unkn
able
Christ

A Pa
L
a

THIS
silver
we wo
the int
five-an
and j
disaste

Th
Lambe
which
if any
Englan
encour
earnest

'De
people
liberty,
enjoy.
Church
movem
which h
heart an
the Cor
bounds

A little
policy
domain
by our
the stat
ago.

'Libe
liberty
establis
trust of
atheism.

The Bis

If Mr. Betts would study the first part of Herbert Spencer's *First Principles* he would see in reference to God that the drift of the whole argumentation is to prove that there cannot possibly be such a Being as the Christian believes God to be—that is, a Supreme, Intelligent, and Moral Being. The negation of such a Being is a *sine qua non* in reference to Evolution. Superficial readers think Spencer admits such a Being to a small extent in his doctrine of the Unknowable. But that is a mistake. The doctrine of the Unknowable is grounded on the negation of God as conceived by the Christian.

A Pastoral Letter from the Right Reverend C. W. Sandford, D.D., Bishop of Gibraltar. (London and Oxford: James Parker and Co., 1897.)

THIS year we believe that the Bishop of Gibraltar will celebrate his silver wedding to his diocese (if we may be allowed the word), and we would offer him our best congratulations on his guardianship of the interests of the Church of England abroad during those past five-and-twenty years. There have been occasions when his firmness and judgment have saved those interests from something like disaster.

The letter opens with a review of the Queen's Jubilee and the Lambeth Conference, and passes on to the consideration of a subject which is evidently very near to the Bishop's heart, viz. the question if any interference on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities of England in the religious affairs of Italians or Spaniards should be encouraged. Any such interference or intrusion the Bishop most earnestly deprecates. He says:

'Deepest sympathy should be entertained by us with all Christian people who are striving to secure for themselves that mental and spiritual liberty, and that purity of doctrine and worship which we ourselves enjoy. But I cannot but feel that public recognition on the part of our Church should be given discriminately, and should be limited to such movements as are self-supporting, are really national, and by the progress which has attended them show that they have taken hold of a people's heart and affections. It may be thought that in expressing our sympathy the Committee [of the Lambeth Conference] somewhat exceeded the bounds of a wise discretion' (p. 32).

A little later on: 'You know also that it has been the traditional policy of our Church not to enter as an active propagandist into the domain of other Churches. The cause of Reform itself is prejudiced by our intrusion.' On the next page the Bishop reminds us that the state of Italy is now very different from what it was forty years ago.

'Liberty of worship is now universally allowed. . . . In Italy this liberty is not unfrequently abused and degenerates into licence; the established religion and Church of the country are often insulted, distrust of the priests having taken the form of venomous and aggressive atheism. . . . Are these the days for us to create further unsettlement?'

The Bishop would hardly write thus unless some danger existed of

interference on our part, and of a repetition of the unfortunate scandals which surrounded the action of the late Archbishop of Dublin in Madrid. The long experience of the Bishop of Gibraltar in Continental affairs enables him to form a judgment in this matter which cannot be lightly set aside, and we sincerely trust that the prudent and cautious policy which he recommends may be followed out by our home authorities.

Repertorium Hymnologicum. Catalogue des Chants, Hymnes, Proses, Séquences, Tropes en usage dans l'Eglise Latine depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours Par le Chanoine ULYSSE CHEVALIER. 4^{me} fascicule. Q-Z. (Louvain: Imprimerie Polleunis et Ceuterick, 1897).

ON the appearance of the first fasciculus of this monumental work we pointed out to our readers its many excellences and its completeness. That it is absolutely complete, of course, cannot be; and such a feature may not be looked for; there are, it must be owned, a certain number of hymns already in print which have escaped M. Chevalier. But the *Repertorium Hymnologicum* will stand many a severe test, as those who have used the earlier fasciculi can testify. During the past year the concluding fasciculus has been published, and it appears that over twenty-two thousand Latin hymns have been duly catalogued. M. Chevalier is at his best when dealing with metrical hymns; and we pointed out in our first notice a sort of indifference on his part to the history of such a composition as *Exultet*. Another instance of this want of affection for non-metrical hymns is shown in this fasciculus under the heading, *Te decet laus, te decet hymnus; tibi gloria Deo Patri*, which is described as a hymn after the gospel at Mattins, to be found in the *Acta SS. Belgii* and in the little English collection called *Hymnarium Sarisburiense*, printed in 1851. The learned Canon gives us no hint that it is one of the hymns of the Benedictine Breviary, common to all those Orders who follow the Benedictine distribution of the Psalms. But this is a trifle. We can only express our deep sense of gratitude to the industrious editor for the invaluable instrument he has put into our hands; and we await the finishing touch to this gigantic undertaking in the preface or introduction (promised to us in the *avant-propos* to the first fasciculus) which is necessary to make us better understand the contractions and other symbols so freely used. Unless this promise be redeemed the value of this enormous piece of work may be seriously diminished.

Pontificale ad usum Ecclesiæ Mediolanensis necnon ordines Ambrosiani. Collegit edidit et notis illustravit DOCTOR MARCUS MAGISTRETTI . . . prefatus est ANTONIUS M. CERIANI. (Mediolani, apud Ulricum Hoepli, 1897.)

THE activity shown in editing and reprinting the Ambrosian books by the sons of St. Ambrose themselves is worthy of all encouragement. Dr. Ceriani has published the greater part of the *Biasca Missal* (unfortunately the edition is still incomplete), and is engaged on a new

edition
dioces
Metro
manus
Monu
immed
manus

Th
ductio
revival
been
of that
in som
touchin
supper

Of
have n
texts an
invalua
readers
to prese
sources
olei An
chrisma
and it
might c
element
before,
a circum
preface.
of the b
variety o
interest
makes it
liturgy, t
all count

The Will
WIL
Lon

We are
bracing
of young
current o
colleges
special b
maturer

¹ De
Ordo Rom
VOL. 2

edition of the Ambrosian Mass-book for daily use in the Milanese diocese. Dr. Magistretti, the Master of the Ceremonies in the Metropolitan Church, has recently re-edited Beroldus from the manuscripts, and the work before us is only the first of a series of *Monumenta Veteris Liturgie Ambrosiane*, and is to be followed immediately by an edition of a *Manuale Ambrosianum* from a manuscript of the eleventh century.

This edition is dedicated to St. Ambrose himself, and an introduction is prefixed by Dr. Ceriani, who gladly remarks on the revival in this century of liturgical studies, the lead in which has been taken by England. Dr. Ceriani speaks without any tinge of that bitterness or jealousy which now and then finds expression in some foreign ritualists, and he ends his introduction with a touching desire for that unity which Our Lord prayed for after supper the night before the Passion.

Of the way in which Dr. Magistretti has performed his part we have nothing but praise. Most convenient references from other texts are given at the foot of the page to similar liturgical forms, an invaluable assistance to the student. And this fact will prepare our readers for disappointment if they expect the Pontifical before them to present many unusual features derived from Gallican or Celtic sources. It was known that Hittorp¹ had printed a *Benedictio olei Ambrosiana* for the sick, and for catechumens, and a *Præfatio chrismatis Ambrosiana*, the opening of which is decidedly Gallican; and it was hoped that so early a manuscript as that now edited might contain a large amount of Gallican or purely Ambrosian elements. But very few of the forms seem not to have been printed before, and the structure of the offices is almost wholly Roman, a circumstance which the editor points out with satisfaction in his preface. Naturally this has diminished somewhat the liturgical interest of the book for the Celtic antiquary, and reduced the Pontifical to a variety of the Roman. Nevertheless this Pontifical has a very large interest of its own, and the careful way in which it has been edited makes it a very valuable and important contribution to the study of liturgy, that will receive a warm welcome from liturgical scholars in all countries.

The Will to Believe, and other Essays in Popular Philosophy. By WILLIAM JAMES, M.D., &c. (New York, London, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897.)

WE are here presented with a volume of thoroughly healthy and bracing essays, which, if specially adapted to the intellectual needs of young students, will also be of much interest to all who watch the current of modern thought on life's deeper problems. In American colleges there are clubs for students who devote themselves to special branches of learning; and as it is their custom to invite maturer scholars to address them, Dr. W. James, Professor of

¹ *De Divinis Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Officiis* (Parisii, 1610), col. 70, Ordo Romanus.

Physiology at Harvard University, delivered most of these essays on such occasions. Their value consists in the author's intimate acquaintance with the mental atmosphere of those whom he is addressing, in the transparent honesty with which he faces burning questions, in his ungrudging admiration of the conquests achieved by science, whilst repelling the untenable assumptions made in its name, and in the courage and ability with which he defends the intellectual legitimacy of religious faith. There, is naturally enough, some inequality in the addresses here brought together, and we think that 'On some Hegelisms,' and possibly also 'On what Psychical Research has accomplished,' might have been advantageously omitted. It is a general, if not inevitable, drawback to the republication of separate essays that the most important are usually placed foremost, so that interest declines as the reader advances; but Dr. James varies his topics, and we are not content to lay down his book until we come to the end.

In his preface Dr. James defends his line of argument by a keen but truthful diagnosis of the varying mental attitudes with which a lecturer may have to deal. A miscellaneous popular crowd needs to have different treatment from academic audiences. 'Paralysis of their native capacity for faith, and timorous *abulia* in the religious field, are the latter's special forms of mental weakness, brought about by the notion, carefully instilled, that there is something called scientific evidence, by waiting upon which they shall escape all danger of shipwreck in regard to truth' (pp. x-xi). To face such danger, however, is a plain duty, and exhortation to it is the staple of several of Dr. W. James's essays. The first of them, 'The Will to Believe,' is a powerful demonstration of the fact that, despite all the boasting of Agnosticism, 'our non-intellectual nature does influence our convictions' (p. 11); pure 'insight and logic, whatever they might do ideally, are not the only things that really do produce our creeds' (*ibid.*). So far from it, a passionate interest in and a desire for the truth of a conclusion is of the utmost importance in scientific as well as in religious study. 'If you want an absolute duffer in an investigation, you must take the man who has no interest whatever in its results. The most useful investigator, because the most sensitive observer, is always he whose eager interest in one side of the question is balanced by an equally keen nervousness lest he become deceived' (p. 21). In this and in the following essay, 'Is Life Worth Living?' Dr. James exposes with much force the absurdity of Clifford's pretentious dictum about the immorality of believing anything without sensible proof. 'Moral questions,' he rightly asserts, cannot wait for such proof; and unless your heart *wants* a world of moral reality, your head will never make you believe in one. Why should it be better to risk loss of truth than chance of error? There are worse things in the world than being duped. Nor does the Agnostic, as he supposes, occupy a neutral position; for since religious faith hinges upon action, he bids us wait, and act in the meanwhile more or less as if religion were *not* true. In direct antagonism to the pseudo-scientific demand for sensible proof

before
James
courage
general
that
one h
before
result

W
which
'Reflex
Minis
James
volum
specia
relatio
suffici

'W
writers
the co
such
G. H.
ings o
unexp
the de
reflex
intellig
the exi
organis
to disp
of Hin
to ente
showin
being v
for min
univers
of a na
object
mind's
more th
structu
allowed

We
which
show th
be foun

The Si
Co
an
DR. AN
that he
the just

before according belief or accepting the responsibility of action, Dr. James urges, 'Not a victory is gained, not a deed of faithfulness or courage is done, except upon a may be; not a service, not a sally of generosity, not a scientific exploration or experiment or text-book, that may not be a mistake. It is only by risking our persons from one hour to another that we live at all. And often enough our faith beforehand in an uncertified result is the only thing that makes the result come true' (p. 59).

We must pass over the essay on 'The Sentiment of Rationality,' which contains many pregnant passages, to notice briefly that on 'Reflex Action and Theism.' This address, to the Unitarian Ministers' Institute at Princeton—to which body we presume Dr. James belongs—is the deepest and most original paper in the volume before us. As Professor of Physiology he is on his own special ground in dealing with the reflex action of the brain in its relation to the doctrine of theism. The following quotation will sufficiently illustrate his style and method:

'We are not the first in the field. There have not been wanting writers enough to say that reflex action, and all that follows from it, give the *coup de grâce* to the superstition of a God. If you open, for instance, such a book on comparative psychology as *Der Thierische Wille* of G. H. Schneider, you will find, sandwiched in among the admirable dealings of the author with his proper subject, and popping out upon us in unexpected places, the most delightfully *naïf* German onslaughts upon the degradation of theologians, and the utter incompatibility of so many reflex adaptations to the environment with the existence of a creative intelligence. There was a time, remembered by many of us here, when the existence of reflex action and all the other harmonies between the organism and the world were held to prove a God. Now they are held to disprove Him. The next turn of the whirligig may bring back proof of Him again. Into this debate about His existence I will not pretend to enter. I must take up humbler ground, and limit my ambition to showing that a God, whether existent or not, is at all events the kind of being which, if He did exist, would form the *most adequate possible object*, for minds framed like our own, to conceive as lying at the root of the universe. My thesis, in other words, is this: that *some* outward reality of a nature defined as God's nature must be defined is the only ultimate object that is at the same time rational and possible for the human mind's contemplation. *Anything short of God is not rational, anything more than God is not possible*, if the human mind be in truth the triadic structure of impression, reflection, and reaction which we at the outset allowed' (pp. 115-16).

We cannot follow the author through the line of argument by which he upholds his position, but enough has we trust been said to show that much food for reflection on topics of burning interest may be found in his pages.

The Silence of God. By ROBERT ANDERSON, C.B., LL.D., Assistant Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1898.)

DR. ANDERSON writes upon an awful subject, and it must be allowed that he writes in a striking style. And when we add to these facts the just claim to attention which a man in his position, writing upon

a religious question which lies within the sphere of all men, possesses, we cannot wonder that the book should circulate. We write before the year in which it is dated has begun, and it has already reached a second edition.

The reflecting reader will be at no loss to conceive a sense in which it would be true to say that God has never been silent, and another in which it would be equally true to lay down that He has never spoken. He has never been silent to the ears of man's soul, which hears Him in the voices of Nature, of conscience, and of the spiritual faculty. On the other hand, as no man hath seen or can see God, so no man can hear Him, either with the outward ear or with any powers which stand parallel to physical hearing, and even the utmost knowledge of God to which we are admitted by revelation leaves Him still unknowable to us in Himself, and inaudible not only to the merely sensual, but even to the merely intellectual man. But what Dr. Anderson means by the Silence of God is His failure to interfere in defence of the weak and suffering amidst the awful calamities which mankind have to endure. No one can have more opportunity to know 'the sorrow and suffering and wrong endured during a single round of the clock even in the favoured metropolis of highly favoured England' And we shall all give our sorrowful assent to the statement that 'the conscience of Christendom is outraged' by the butchery of sixty thousand Armenians at the hands of the cruel Turk.

Those are subjects of natural dismay to all thinking minds. And the worst of it is that there is nothing new or extraordinary in them. Massacres far more extensive, cruelties and oppressions and wrongs immeasurably wider and more persistent have filled a large part of man's experience in the world. And even where man's powers to inflict suffering could not reach, Nature herself, 'red in tooth and claw,' has taken up the terrible task. Not one Armenian has been slain by the Turks who would not have been slain by nature after a little more of life. Not one of the children whose short-lived pangs under the murderer's knife rouse our pity was safe from natural diseases which inflict sufferings immeasurably greater upon the young. The difference between our time and the ages which are past is not that there is more suffering in ours, but that there is in ours such a thing as a 'conscience of Christendom' to be shocked by such sorrows, instead of accepting them as recognized conditions of human life.

And this phrase, used by Dr. Anderson himself, points to the only consideration which to our minds seems capable of depriving the view of human suffering of its sceptical power. It would not be fair in any case to urge the suffering of the creature without taking any account of its happiness, to remember the bloody scenes of Armenian murder without thinking that the measure of happiness for every individual sufferer among them, even in this life, much exceeded that of pain. But when we add to this the growth of pity and kindness among Christian men, more active and far-reaching for good than selfishness is for evil, we have certainly something to set against the catalogue of horrors.

den
sha
God
bein
over
terr
whic
on t
ther
God
prot
bett

God
repr
The
tion
we a
his c
now
in c
com
of th
what
feeb
it see
of th
requ
silenc
God
hand

W
given
be ex
the m
apost
to pu
exerc
self.
subm
blish
natur
is, on
save t
long a
W
from
likely
to the

For our part we find in our moral nature a far more imperative demand for some influence in human life, individual and social, that shall be essentially contrary to evil than for any breach of silence on God's part to protest against evil. We can understand (without being able to explain it) that there is some dread impossibility to overcome evil except by moral means. It would, therefore, be a terrible difficulty to us if we had to confess that the moral means which God has given us are insufficient even when rightly used. But, on the contrary, it seems to us that they are sufficient. We should not, therefore, be relieved of any difficulty by a miraculous protest on God's part against human wickedness. We do not see how such a protest would of itself diminish wickedness; and if it did not it had better not be made.

Dr. Anderson accepts the Christian revelation as an utterance on God's part sufficient for the time being to remove from Him the reproach of silence. We do not regard our religion in such a light. The insufficiency of its miracles by themselves to prove an intervention on the part of God is maintained by Dr. Anderson himself; and we agree with him, only protesting that he need not have presented his opinion on this point as a novelty. It is pretty well agreed on now that Paley went too far, and that miracles have their power only in combination with moral and spiritual forces. It was not uncommon to hear it said that Paley accepted the doctrine on account of the miracles, and we the miracles on account of the doctrine. And whatever power we allow to the miracles in argument they would be feeble voices from God against the mass of evil in the world. But it seems to us that the very root idea of Christianity, the very reason of the Incarnation, is found in the fact that the order of the universe requires that evil shall be conquered by enduring. Never was the silence of God exemplified in so awful a form as when the Son of God was crucified by sinful men and the Father stretched out no hand to save Him.

When, therefore, the ascending Saviour declares that all power is given unto Him in heaven and in earth, His words must in reason be explained in harmony with the course of His own life and with the message to observe His commands, which He was giving by his apostles to all nations. We cannot regard Him as claiming a power to put down evil with a high hand, which the Father Himself did not exercise, and which His own Cross and passion renounced for Himself. His power was to give victory to His Church by that way of submission in which His victory had been gained. And the establishment of His mediatorial kingdom is so far from aggravating our natural repugnance to the silence of God while evil flourishes that it is, on the contrary, the signal that no other method of conquering evil save the silent method of the Cross is to be expected from God so long as the world lasts.

When we turn to Dr. Anderson's own reply to doubts arising from the evil in the world, we cannot say that we think them likely to give satisfaction. These fearful facts are natural, and appeal to the natural man. It is useless to give him replies which possess

a theological character and require religious belief. Nevertheless this is what Dr. Anderson does. He commences his book by stating the perplexities of pain and misery in the strongest terms which he can find, and concludes it by telling the reader that

'the era of the reign of grace is precisely the era of the silence of God. To grace therefore we look to explain the silence. Christianity is the supreme and final revelation of the Divine kindness and love toward man. Therefore when God again declares Himself it can only be in wrath. . . . From the throne of the Divine Majesty there has gone forth the proclamation of pardon and peace, and this without condition and reserve. And now a silent heaven gives continuing proof that this great amnesty is still in force.'

There is nothing here which affords any intelligible answer to the doubts of the irreligious man as he views the evil of the world. We must ourselves confess that we cannot understand how the existence of a divine amnesty accounts for God's permission of the Armenian massacres. We offer a very different reply when we say that God's silence does not mean non-interference, and that a mighty system of war against evil is in never-ceasing operation, which would have long since caused enmity between man and man to cease in all the world if man had used God's gifts in Christ as surely as God gives them.

In contrasting the dispensation in which we live with all that preceded it, so sharply that in it a silence upon God's part is appropriate as it never was before, Dr. Anderson explains Scripture history very differently from the Church. To her it has never seemed that God withdrew into silence, however the methods of His speech to men might vary in various times. But while Dr. Anderson visits with extremest condemnation any failure to accept the inspiration of Holy Scripture in its strongest Protestant form, there is really only one part of Scripture which in his view is adapted to our condition—namely, the Epistles of St. Paul. The crisis which deprived the favoured race of privilege was made the occasion of a 'new revelation' to mankind; and the Pauline epistles record it. So sharply does the author distinguish this new revelation from the old that the early Apostolic Church is regarded by him as Jewish, and that miracles were in his view confined to those Jewish times in which God was not silent, and ceased when the Gospel was carried to the Gentiles.

The latter view is certainly mistaken. Miracles were wrought for Gentiles as well as for Jews, and by St. Paul as well as by the Twelve. The reader will at once recall the cases of Elymas the sorcerer, of the cripple at Lystra, of the damsel at Philippi, the special miracles which God wrought at Ephesus by the hands of Paul, the Divine gifts at Corinth, and the miracles worked among the Galatians, to which St. Paul appeals in opposition to Judaizing doctrine. Whatever explanation we give of the use and of the cessation of miracles, they appeared and they ceased among Jew and Gentile alike.

The Apostolic Church was only Jewish in the sense that those who composed it were Jews who used in their personal religion those

Jewish practices to which St. Paul himself conformed, not only when he was at Jerusalem, but even in heathen countries. They lingered long, perhaps too long, amidst the familiar scenes and institutions of that religion until persecution scattered them to preach the Word. But they had received from their Master such instruction as rendered a new revelation quite needless for the purpose of inducing them to admit all mankind to the Church. He had Himself made disciples of Samaritans who were Gentiles of a race the most objectionable to Jews as pretending to the privileges of the chosen people without any right. Many of His miracles were done for Gentiles. The good Samaritan was the model hero of His parables. All nations were to be gathered at His judgment, and separated not as Jew and Gentile, but as righteous and unrighteous; and His commission to the Apostles was to make disciples of all nations. The Lord Himself was the revealer of the world-wide invitations and gifts which He received for men. That all the world was to be admitted all His Apostles knew from Pentecost, and it was only some among them who doubted for a time whether the Jewish law was not in some way to be imposed upon the converts. When Philip baptized the Samaritans two Apostles were sent without demur to bless his work. There is no sign that the men of Cyprus and Cyrene who admitted Greeks at Antioch did so by any prompting except the general spirit of the Church. St. Paul in teaching the fullest doctrine of the freedom of the Gospel and justification by faith is particularly careful to set it forth, not as a new revelation, but the universal teaching of God in all times. And the Apostles at Jerusalem fully sanctioned and approved his teaching. Thus the severance which Dr. Anderson makes between the last stage of God's dealing with men and those which precede is very full of historic exaggeration and error. And the view which his book sets before us, both of God and His world, is different indeed from that which we have learnt from the Church and the Bible, and to our thinking far inferior.

The Golden Treasury; selected from the best Songs and Lyrical Poems in the English Language, and arranged, with Notes, by FRANCIS T. PALGRAVE, late Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford. Second Series. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1897.)

MR. PALGRAVE, whose recent death has removed one of the most competent critics of this generation, has the distinction of having produced the best anthology of English poetry that has yet seen the light. *The Golden Treasury* will preserve his name and reputation longer than any of his original poems or larger volumes of criticism, and that in spite of the rapidly increasing number of rival anthologies. Its excellence is due to a singularly even balance of critical judgment, which saves it from any grave defects of either omission or inclusion. Editors of anthologies are too apt to favour some one period or poet at the expense of others; to exalt the Elizabethan or the Georgian age to the disadvantage of the Caroline or Augustan; to run riot among the devotional lyrics of Vaughan and Crashaw, or to overwhelm the poets of the early nineteenth century beneath the

predominance of Wordsworth. Mr. Palgrave was capable of discerning the best work of all periods, and had no special discoveries of his own to push into undue prominence; and, it should perhaps be added, he had the assistance of the fine taste of Lord Tennyson. Hence, although *The Golden Treasury* may not contain so many unfamiliar poems as certain other anthologies, it has the best and most evenly proportioned display of the finest poetry in the English language, and is less liable than others to be affected by changes in the taste and fancies of the passing day.

It is this pre-eminence of the first series which gives a special interest to its successor, which made its appearance only a week before its editor's death. There was a natural curiosity to see what a critic with a reputation for taste so well established would make of the poetry of the present day. He, if anyone, ought to be able to pierce below the fashions of the moment and anticipate the verdict of posterity. It cannot be denied, however, that the first feeling likely to be experienced after a study of the new volume is one of disappointment. The first series was limited to poems produced before 1850, and by poets no longer alive in 1861. Practically what was left at Mr. Palgrave's disposal was the poetry of the Victorian age; and a selection extending over the sixty years of the present reign, and compiled by so skilled a hand, could hardly have failed to be both interesting and instructive. Unfortunately Mr. Palgrave has excluded from his view practically all the writers who can fairly be spoken of as the poets of the present generation. In his pleasant and modest preface he states that 'the selection has been brought, near as I can venture, to our own day'; but his courage has been too largely tempered by discretion. An anthology cannot be regarded as fully representative of the Victorian age which contains no examples of Robert Bridges, Meredith, Austin Dobson, Watson, Kipling, Stevenson, Andrew Lang, Henley, Michael Field, Mrs. Meynell, or others who might be mentioned. It can hardly be supposed that either the poets or their publishers would have thrown any difficulties in the way of an advertisement so clearly advantageous to their common interests. A more serious omission, for which, however, Mr. Palgrave is not responsible, but either the poet or his publisher, is that of Mr. Swinburne; and the motive of either poet or publisher is to us wholly unintelligible.

The result is that Mr. Palgrave has practically compiled his selection from the poetry of his own generation, which, as his own death painfully reminds us, is passing away. The great names of his volume are Tennyson, the Brownings, the Rossettis, Arnold, Clough, and Patmore. The less known names most largely represented are William Barnes (the admirable Dorsetshire poet), Charles Tennyson-Turner, and Arthur O'Shaughnessy. The latter is unquestionably the surprise of the volume. Mr. Palgrave declares that his 'metrical gift seems to me the finest, after Tennyson's, of any of our later poets; he has a haunting music all his own.' One hesitates to echo so high a praise; yet the specimens of O'Shaughnessy's work included in this volume are certainly striking, and contain much that is beau-

tiful
of m
The
R. V
enou
nam
Mas
upon

Y
Gola
adm
a litt
there
Ross
Cry
Port
lyrics
Love
well
Epil
—too
good
If on
knife
Tenn
to ad
have
so far
years
range
worth

Wha

FATH
good
plete
whole
has b
the p
of Sa
positi
Gardi
Gover
Moun
clearly
to giv
critici
is furn

tiful in thought and expression, together with a musical command of metre. Mr. Palgrave's other 'discoveries' are less satisfactory. The poems by the Duke of Argyll, T. Ashe, G. J. Romanes, and R. Wilton, though unquestionably meritorious, are not distinguished enough for such a volume as this should be; and even better known names, such as John Clare, Alfred Domett, R. S. Hawker, Gerald Massey, Newman, Peacock, and Trench, leave little distinctive mark upon it, while the representation of Landor is wholly inadequate.

Yet, when all is said and done in the way of detraction, this second *Golden Treasury* remains a very pleasant volume, and contains much admirable poetry. It is a delightful occupation to turn the pages of a little book which may easily be a pocket companion, and to find there now Tennyson's *Revenge*, now Arnold's *Scholar-Gipsy*, now Rossetti's *Blessed Damozel*, now Browning's *Rabbi Ben Ezra*. *The Cry of the Children* is here, and several of the *Sonnets from the Portuguese*, and the love sonnets of Rossetti, and the beautiful lyrics of his sister, and the songs from *Empedocles on Etna*, and *Love among the Ruins* (but not *By the Fireside*), and Patmore's *Farewell* ('With all my will, but much against my heart'), and the *Epilogue to Asolando*, and *Crossing the Bar*. These and many more—too many to enumerate, but all intimately dear to those who love good poetry—are to be had here for the trouble of turning the pages. If only the editor could have brought himself to use the pruning-knife more sternly—to cut down even the representation of Alfred Tennyson, much more of Charles—and had summoned up courage to add the best examples of the work of our younger poets, he would have produced a volume worthy to follow the first *Golden Treasury*, so far as a volume gleaned from sixty years—rich as the last sixty years have been in lyrical poetry—might be compared with one which ranges over all the field of English literature from Spenser to Wordsworth.

What Gunpowder Plot was. By SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER, D.C.L., LL.D., Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897.)

FATHER GERARD's volume *What was the Gunpowder Plot?* has done good service in causing Professor Gardiner to produce such a complete reply as is to be found in *What Gunpowder Plot was*. The whole evidence has been thoroughly sifted, and the traditional story has been shown to be well grounded. Father Gerard had taken up the position that the conspiracy was 'a fiction devised by the Earl of Salisbury for the purpose of maintaining or strengthening his position in the government of the country' (p. 1). Professor Gardiner has shown how improbable it is that anyone in the Government should have known of the plot before the receipt of Mounteagle's letter. The whole argument is admirably evolved and clearly stated, point after point in Father Gerard's hypothesis having to give way to the masterly examination of an expert in historical criticism. The book contains seven chapters, making 200 pages, and is furnished with eight excellent illustrations, which present views

and plans of the houses and gardens adjoining the House of Lords, together with one of the famous cellar. There is also a full chronological table, showing each event from the accession of James I. (March 24, 1603) to the capture of the conspirators at Holbeche (November 8, 1605). 'Father Gerard,' says the Professor, 'is unversed in the methods of historical inquiry which have guided recent scholars' (p. 3); he has depended upon rumours more than upon contemporary documents; he has nothing to suggest in place of the traditional story; his is only negative criticism (pp. 12-13), whereas the Professor himself starts with the hypothesis 'that the traditional story is true—cellar, mine, the Mounteagle letter and all' (p. 13), and proceeds to examine it in detail. First, he sifts Guy Fawkes's story during his examination from November 5 to 8, and shows that, while there may be discrepancies in it, there is nothing to implicate Salisbury (p. 21), and he establishes the truth about the mine and the cellar from the evidence produced. Next the later evidence is examined, beginning with what came out when Guy Fawkes was under torture on November 9, the conspirators having been taken on the day before at Holbeche. After this he studies the structural difficulties respecting the mine and the cellar, and, by a series of illustrations, shows the exact spot where the conspiracy took place. This fourth chapter is particularly interesting, but it requires careful reading, because of its elaborate argument. In the next chapter we have the story of the discovery of the plot, and the proof that Mounteagle's letter was the first information that the Government had of it. The last two chapters deal with the relations of the Government to the Catholics and to the priests; they are, perhaps, less interesting in themselves, but they serve to make Father Gerard's hypothesis more improbable. Altogether Professor Gardiner's book is a first-rate piece of work; not a point is missed, and the argument is well sustained from the beginning to the end; the Professor is a courteous but an unsparing critic. The question of the truth of the Gunpowder Plot ought to be set at rest by this book for many years to come. For the general reader it may be a little too elaborate and technical, but for those who love a clever piece of detailed criticism it is quite delightful to read.

Since the above was written Father Gerard has published¹ a reply to, or, rather, has picked holes in, Professor Gardiner's work. He has tried to prove that the Winter confession is the work of a skilful Government forger, and so would overthrow the traditional story. We cannot say that the reply has convinced us, though here and there a point has been scored, which we have little doubt the Professor would be able to deal with effectually. We cannot commend the tone in which this pamphlet has been written, and we do not think that Father Gerard has improved his position by trying to bring into disrepute 'the approved methods of the Oxford School of History' (p. 5).

¹ *The Gunpowder Plot and the Gunpowder Plotters.* By John Gerard, S.J. London: Harper and Brothers, 1897.

1. *Lettres d'un Curé de Campagne*. Publiées par YVES LE QUERDEC. (Paris : Librairie V. Lecoffre, 1896.)
2. *Lettres d'un Curé de Canton*. Publiées par YVES LE QUERDEC. (Paris : Librairie V. Lecoffre, 1896.)

THIS is a delightful book, and interesting to 'country vicars' in England as well as in France. We have our difficulties, and at times it is possible that we may exaggerate them, but the experiences of the curé of St. Julien show that our neighbours have theirs also, amusingly like and yet unlike our own. He is young, eager, and simple-minded; he enters on his first sole charge with the brightest anticipations, which are somewhat chilled by his first reception; but his goodness and faith carry him through all, in spite of mistakes and misunderstandings, and gradually win for him the respect and affection even of his opponents. Political difficulties beset the country parson at this present time in France, and with all his prudence he finds it impossible not to give offence. He resolves to make friends with all his parishioners, whatever their opinions may be, and unwittingly hurts the feelings of the great man of the place, who is the chief benefactor to the church, by having called on the Revolutionary innkeeper and other Radicals before paying his respects at the Château. The harangue of the Marquis de St. Julien to the poor young curé on the occasion of his first visit is inimitable, but too long to quote (pp. 27-8). However, the wrath of the great man is soon appeased, and he and his family become the main support of the curé in all his efforts for the good of the parish. We cannot follow the history of the gradual transformation he effects, especially among the younger members of his flock. The *naïveté* and frankness with which he relates his proceedings, the mistakes he so freely acknowledges and retrieves with such amiability and patience, win for him our warmest sympathies, and we heartily recommend the book, with its sequel (*Lettres d'un Curé de Canton*), to all who are glad not only to have fresh lights upon parochial work, but also to make the acquaintance of a very charming French book, full of happy touches and life-like descriptions of character and scenery. The main interest of the second volume lies in the curé's dealings with the working people in a manufacturing town; the gradual formation of guilds and clubs on rather different lines from those he instituted in his former parish, and the vivid description of a strike in which he played the part of a peacemaker. We have not space to do more than indicate the character of these two fascinating books, but we must find room for an extract from the curé's account of his first interview with the good Sisters (who keep a little school for girls), and to whose care he transfers the charge of the vestments and church linen, to which his predecessor had devoted great part of his time.

'Cela convenu, Sœur Agnès me dit : Et le catéchisme, M. le curé, faudra-t-il que nous le fassions ?

'—Le catéchisme, ma bonne sœur ! mais assurément vous devez le faire. Votre école est une école libre. . . . La religieuse se mit à rire : Certainement nous faisons le catéchisme chez nous. . . . Mais c'est du catéchisme à l'église que je vous parlais. M. M . . . m'avait chargée de le remplacer, et je vous demandais si je devais continuer, si dimanche, par exemple, je devrai faire le catéchisme avant les vêpres.

'—Alors, repris-je, c'était vous qui faisiez le catéchisme à l'église ?

'—Oui, monsieur le curé.

'—Aux garçons de l'institutur ?

'—Et aux petites filles de l'institutrice, oui, monsieur le curé.

'—Et cela se passait bien ? Personne ne s'est plaint ? Vous n'avez pas eu des difficultés ?

'—Non, monsieur le curé. Je faisais réciter le catéchisme, je marquais pour M. le curé ceux qui répondaient bien et ceux qui répondaient mal. Je donnais quelques petites explications. M. le curé venait ensuite, punissait ou récompensait suivant les cas et complétait mes explications. C'était déjà beaucoup pour lui que les rhumatismes tourmentaient, car l'église est froide et humide, et chaque séance de catéchisme lui valait des jours entiers de souffrances.

'—Ma sœur, je vous remercie. Grâce à Dieu je ne suis pas encore rhumatisant. Je ferai les catéchismes. Que ferais-je donc, grand Dieu, si je ne faisais pas cela ? Veuillez seulement à ce que vos petites filles le sachent mieux que personne.

'Et les bonnes sœurs prirent congé' (pp. 10-11).

The Holy Orders of the Church of England, addressed to Laymen.

By GEORGE A. SPOTTISWOODE, Vice-Chairman of the House of Laymen for the Province of Canterbury. Published under the direction of the Tract Committee. (London : S.P.C.K., 1898.)

At the very last moment of going to press we have received two goodly volumes by an American clergyman (the Rev. Arthur Lowndes, D.D.), entitled *A Vindication of Anglican Orders*; and at the same time we see announced for publication the Reply of his Eminence Cardinal Vaughan to the *Answer of the Archbishops of England* to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII. At these publications our inexorable printers will not allow us so much as to glance. They must stand over for a future number of the *Church Quarterly Review*. Meanwhile we are very thankful to be provided with a succinct and, as far as we can judge, a most lucid and accurate statement, in the main, of the points at issue, in the short Tract of less than twenty pages issued by the S.P.C.K., from the pen of Mr. George A. Spottiswoode, 'whose praise is in all the churches.' The object of this Tract is 'only to afford such an outline as may assist the ordinary Layman to a general understanding of the subjects.' The scope of this useful publication, which we cordially commend to the notice of our readers, may best be gathered from a list of the contents : I. The Principles which guide the Church of England. II. The Apostolic Commission. III. How the Apostles understood their Commission. IV. Remarks [which we think might advantageously have been omitted]. V. What the Church of England claims. VI. The Transmission of Holy Orders. VII. 'Form' and 'Intention.' Specially valuable is the Appendix, which sets out in parallel columns the Papal Bull and the Answer of our Archbishops. Like Iago, we are 'nothing if not critical,' so we venture to ask why 'The Holy Orders of the Church of England' on the title-page becomes, overleaf, 'Holy Orders in the Church of England,' which is surely the more correct ? The chapter or section on 'Form' and 'Intention' is altogether admirable.

AD
tory
tion
vies
Ander
523
Apocr
Apo
inte
cryp
tinu
writ
the
liter
of S
prop
conc
tian
tras
156
157
158
and
Anti
scrip
lopm
the
Jesu
Athan
man
on, 8
81 ;
antic
Chri
and
MS.
comm
Vena
and
Engl
other
langu
date,
St. V

INDEX TO VOL. XLV.

ADD

ANDERLEY, Mr. J., *Looking Upward: Papers introductory to the study of Social questions from a religious point of view*, 255

Anderson, Dr., *The Silence of God*, 523

Apocryphal Apocalypses and the Apocalypse of St. John, 151 *sqq.*: interest of the study of *Apocrypha*, 152; origin of the continuous series of Apocalyptic writings, 153; inter-relations of the Jewish and early Christian literatures, 154; the Apocalypse of St. John the climax of Jewish prophecy, 155; two dominant conceptions in nearly all Christian Apocalyptic literature: contrast of Christ and Antichrist, 156; the 'Legend of Antichrist', 157; the Beast of the Apocalypse, 158; conceptions of the physical and intellectual characteristics of Antichrist, 159; Apocalyptic description of Christ, 160; development in the middle ages, 161; the conception of the glorified Jesus, 162

Athanasian Creed, the, Mr. Omanney's Critical Dissertation on, 80 *sqq.*: sketch of the work, 81; documentary evidence of the antiquity of this Creed, 82; the *Vita Christi* of Ludolphus, 83; canons and injunctions of bishops, 84; MS. copies of the Creed, *ib.*; commentaries or expositions: Venantius Fortunatus, 85; Greek and English versions, 86; the English translation of 1549, and other versions, 87; the original language of the Creed, and its date, 88; its author or compiler: St. Vincent Lerins 'highly pro-

BET

bable,' 90; the titles of the Creed, 91; the reception and use of it, 92; need of circulating good commentaries on it, 93; an objection answered, 94

BARING-GOULD, Mr., on St.

Paul, 296 *sqq.*: what might be anticipated from so voluminous and varied an author, 296; disappointed expectations, 297; blemishes of tone and style in the book, 298; examples of awkward phrases, and love of fine words, 299; repeated statements of theories and surmises as accepted facts, 300; persistent depreciation of St. Paul's intellect, ability, temper, and success, 301; St. Paul's 'overbearing imperiousness,' 302; an attack on St. Stephen, 303; insinuation of untruthfulness against St. Paul, 304; charge of wilful misquoting of Scripture, 305; St. Paul's lack of prudence in admitting converts, 307; Mr. Baring-Gould's notions of the development of the Church, 308; attribution of unworthy motives to St. Paul, 309; a catalogue of his imputed deficiencies, 310; Mr. Baring-Gould has attempted a task altogether beyond his powers, 311

Barnes, Rev. A. S., *The Popes and the Ordinal*, 231

Bedford, Adeline, Duchess of, The World of Light: Brief Extracts from Early Greek Liturgies, 242

Beet, Rev. Dr., *The New Life in Christ: a Study in Personal Religion*, 226

Betts, Rev. J. A., *The Bearing of the Theory of Evolution on Christian Doctrine*, 518

BEW

- Bewes, Mr. W. A., *Church Briefs: or, Royal Warrants for Collections for Charitable Objects*, 249
- Bonus, Mr. A., *Collatio Codicis Lewisiani rescripti Evangeliorum Sacrorum Syriacorum cum Codice Curetoniano*, 485
- Browne, Bishop (Bristol), *Theodore and Wilfrith*, 511
- Bruce, Rev. Dr., *With Open Face; or, Jesus Mirrored in Matthew, Mark, and Luke*, 496
- Butler, Dr. Samuel, *Life and Letters of* (by his Grandson), 94 *sqq.*: Dr. Butler's life at Rugby: a genius for classics, 96; his undergraduate career at Cambridge, 97; appointed headmaster of Shrewsbury School: state of the school, *ib.*; details of Dr. Butler's difficulties, 99; his methods of teaching and his success, 101; jealousy of his pupils' success at the Universities, 102; Dr. Kennedy's account of the work of Shrewsbury boys, 104; Butler Archdeacon of Derby: the condition of the Church, 105; a difficulty with the Evangelical clergy, 106; character of Butler's letters, 107; his faith in the Divinity of Christ, 108; his letter to Bishop Maltby: character of the Bishops of his day, 109; his work as Bishop of Lichfield, *ib.*

CELTIC Church in Wales, *The* (Mr. Willis Bund's work), 130 *sqq.*: present lack of study of Welsh Christianity, 130; object of Mr. Willis Bund's book, 131; its character, 132; definition of terms: 'Wales,' 'Christianity,' 133; origin of Welsh Christianity, 134; the religions of the 'Brythons' and the 'Goidels,' 135; the author's theory of the blending of Druidism with Christianity, 136; and that Pelagianism was Goidelic Christianity, 137; the work of St. Germanus, 138; early Welsh history, 139; invasion of Cunedda, 140; the Picts, 141; origin of the Welsh, 142; blending of Welsh Chris-

CHU

- tianity with that of the English Church, 143; character of the Goidelic Christians, 144; peculiar customs, 145; meaning of the 'tribe of the Saint,' 146; monastic societies: Welsh Saints, 147; origin of the parish churches in Wales, 148; celibate monks and married clergy, 149; position of abbats, and of bishops, 149 *sq.*
- Cheetham, Rev. Dr., *The Mysteries, Pagan and Christian: being the Hulsean Lectures for 1896-97*, 516
- Chevalier, Rev. Canon, *Repertorium Hymnologicum*, 520
- Christian Ecclesia, The* (by the late Dr. Hort), 312 *sqq.*: the author's reason for using the term 'Ecclesia,' 312; meaning of the word, 313; discussion of the terms 'Apostles,' the 'Twelve,' the 'Disciples,' 314; criticism of Dr. Hort's conclusions, 316; Catholic doctrine of the priesthood, 317; Dr. Hort's interpretation of the 'laying on of hands' in the New Testament, 319; criticism of his view, 320; and of his opinion on the use of *ἐπίσκοπος* and its relation to *πρεσβύτερος*, 323; the position of St. James in the Council of Jerusalem, 324; on the unity of the Church, 325; Dr. Hort's distinction between the 'Christian Ecclesia' and the 'Kingdom of Heaven,' 327; Dr. Moberly's criticism (in *Ministerial Priesthood*) of Dr. Hort's book, 328 *n.*; general appreciation of the latter, 329
- Church in England, The* (Canon Overton's work in 'The National Churches' series), 471 *sqq.*: the author's style, 472; the map, 474; the true position of Gregory and Augustine in the life of English Christianity, 475; the Church from the Conquest to Henry VII., 476; after the last rejection of the Papal power, 477; in the Stuart period, 478; Canon Overton's defence of the Church as 'the oldest, the grandest, the

CON

most practically useful society' in the land, 479

Confirmation and Baptism, the relation of, 357 *sqq.*: Dr. Pusey's view, 358; Father Puller's: that Confirmation sets up in the soul a new relation to the Holy Ghost, which it had not before, 358 *sq.*; statement of Dr. Mason's view: that Confirmation is not a separate Sacrament, but the second part of the one Sacrament of Baptism, 360; views of Bishop Kingdon, Dr. Bright, Archdeacon Hutchings, 362; Canon Gore's view, 363; Dr. Wirgman's view: that the work of Confirmation is to confer special gifts, 364; criticisms of these several views, 366; exegesis of texts in the Acts, 367 *sqq.*; teaching of the Eastern Fathers, 370; of the Western, 371; what they meant by Baptism, 372; the doctrine of the Service Books of the Church, 374; meaning of the 'gift of the Spirit' in Baptism, 379; notice of Dr. Wirgman's book, *The Doctrine of Confirmation*, 381

Cowan, Professor, *The Influence of the Scottish Church in Christendom; being the Baird Lecture for 1895*, 507

Crosleigh, Rev. Dr., *The Bible in the Light of To-day*, 485

Cyprian: *his Life, his Times, his Work* (Archbishop Benson's work), 25 *sqq.*: account of Carthage and its society in Cyprian's days, 26; position of the Church in the Roman Empire, 28; Cyprian's conversion and earliest writings, 29; election as Bishop of Carthage, 30; his doctrine on the Christian ministry, 31; moral condition of his diocese, 33; persecution: Cyprian leaves Carthage, *ib.*; treatment of the Lapsed: Cyprian's method and its critics, 35; his teaching on the spiritual unity of the Church, 38; the forged interpolations in this treatise, 40; his conduct during a great plague, 41; his treatise *On the Mortality*, 43; his rela-

DIM

tions with Rome: the Spanish appeal to Carthage, 44; decision, against the Pope, of the Fourth Council of Carthage, 45; conduct and issue of the Gaulish appeal: Papal treatment of Cyprian's letter to the Pope, *ib.*; Dr. Benson's description of the seventh Council under Cyprian, 46; its decision on heretical baptism, 49; renewed persecution by Valerian, *ib.*; martyrdom of Cyprian, 51; general appreciation of Archbishop Benson's work, 51 *sqq.*

DEVELOPMENT of Religion, the, 110 *sqq.*: Mr. Crozier's *History of Intellectual Development*: the author's object, an account of Evolution in active life, 111; difficulties of his thesis, 112; his treatment of the respective methods of the ancient and the modern world in the promotion of good, 113; the author's distinction of the Religion of Jesus from the dogmas of the Christian Church, 114; the 'Genius of the World' and Christianity, 116; Mr. Crozier's version of the Life of Christ, 118; his view of the special work done by Christianity, 120.

—Notice of Mr. Taylor's *Ancient Ideals*: object and purpose of the book, 122; the advance of the human race in its various nations: Egypt, 123; Chaldaea, China, India, 124; Hittites, Phœnicians, Greeks, 125; Greek religion and conceptions of life and morals, 126; Roman religion, 127; the Hebrew, *ib.*; the evidences for the truth of our religion, 128; general estimate of Mr. Taylor's work, 129

Dimock, Rev. N., *The Christian Doctrine of Sacerdotium as contained in the Scriptures and taught in our Formularies*, 263; *Vox Liturgiae Anglicanae: the History of the Book of Common Prayer in its Bearing on present Eucharistic Controversies*, 488

DIV

Divorce: Report as received by the Lower House of the Convocation of York, 245

Dowden, Bishop (Edinburgh), *The Bishop Paddock Lectures*, 1896-1897, 259

Du Bose, Professor, *The Ecumenical Councils* ('Eras of the Christian Church' series), 246

ECCLESIASTICAL Law in England, 450 *sqq.*: notice of second edition of Sir R. Phillimore's work on the subject, 451; Mr. Reichel's *Complete Manual of Canon Law*, 454; his treatment of appeals and the Royal Supremacy, 457; the relation of the episcopate to the presbyterate, 460; how far has the Canon Law been recognized by the Church of England? 462; views of Phillimore, Dr. Maitland, Mr. Collins, and Bishop Stubbs, 462 *sqq.*; decay of discipline and decrepitude of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, 466; the Court of Final Appeal, 467; recommendation of the study of the Canon Law, 469

English Church, the planting of the, 1 *sqq.*: Canon Mason's handbook, *The Mission of St. Augustine to England*, 3; the authorities on the subject, 4; some defects in the handbook, 6; appreciation of the value of the mission of Augustine, 9; the spread of Christianity from Canterbury as the centre, 10; liturgical questions, 11; notice of the third edition of Dr. Bright's *Chapters of Early English Church History*, 12; the old bishoprics, 13; discussion of place names, 14; interesting additions to the work, 17; the new 'Church of the English' not the development of the 'ancient British Church,' 18; summary of the Rev. T. Moore's *Beginnings of the English Church and Kingdom*, 20; a suggested method of teaching Church history in elementary schools, 21; criticism

HUG

of Cardinal Vaughan's address at Ramsgate, 23; his suggestive omissions, 24

FISKE, Mr. A. K., *The Myths of Israel: the Ancient Book of Genesis, with Analysis and Explanation of its Composition*, 503

Forrest, Rev. D. W., *The Christ of History and of Experience: being the Ker Lectures for 1897*, 513

Freytag, Gustav, *Martin Luther* (trans. H. E. O. Heinemann), 501

GARDINER, Professor, *What Gunpowder Plot was*, 529

Gerard, Rev. John, *The Gunpowder Plot and the Gunpowder Plotters*, 530

Gibson, Mrs., *Studia Sinaitica*, No. V., *Apocrypha Sinaitica*, 483

Gray, Mr. G. B., *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*, 228

HALL, Bishop (Vermont), *Christ's Temptation and ours: the Baldwin Lectures*, 1896, 508

Hammerstein, Father L. von, *Foundations of Faith: the Existence of God demonstrated* (translated), 262

Hammond, Rev. J., *A Cornish Parish: being an Account of St. Austell, Town, Church, District, and People*, 490

Hatch, the late Dr., and Redpath, H. A., *A Concordance to the Septuagint* (completion of the work), 222

Hemphill, Rev. Dr., *My Neighbour: Plain Studies for my People*, 261

Henson, Rev. H. H., *Light and Leaven*, 515

Hommel, Dr. Fritz, *Die altisraelitische Ueberlieferung in inschriftlicher Beleuchtung* (also Translation into English by E. McClure and L. Crosslé), 480

Hughes, Rev. H., *Religious Faith:*

HUM

an *Essay in the Philosophy of Religion*, 493
 Humphrey, Rev. W., *His Divine Majesty: or, The Living God*, 506

JAMES, Dr. W., *The Will to Believe, and other Essays in Popular Philosophy*, 521

Jowett, Benjamin, *The Life and Letters of* (by E. Abbott and L. Campbell), 382 *sqq.*: criticism of the editors' work, 383; Jowett's love of his mother, 384; the salary of the Greek Professor, 385; his devotion to his pupils, 386; his ambition, 388; shrewd observations on men and things, 389; appreciation of Mr. Gladstone, 390; characteristics as a scholar, 391; attraction to Plato, 392; growth of his conception of Christianity, 393; contact with W. G. Ward, 394; *Tract XC.*: its effect on Jowett's religious views, 395; gradual surrender of essential principles of Christianity, 398; his caution in inculcating his views, 399; opinion of Renan's *Vie de Jésus*, 400; of the *Imitation of Christ*, 402; his rationalistic views, 403; ideas of a new Christianity, 404; incompatibility of his beliefs and his actions, 405; his accusations of dishonesty against others recoil on himself, 406; the mischief he has wrought: an antidote, 407

KING'S SCHOOL, Canterbury, *Sermons preached in the Cathedral at the Commemoration of Founders of*, 1887-96, 261

LAMBETH Conference, the, 190 *sqq.*: its status and objects, 191; Bishop Mitchinson's opinion of these Conferences, 192; the *Encyclical Letter from the Bishops*, 194; declarations on intemperance, the sin of impurity, and the sanctity of marriage, 195; the organization of the Anglican communion, 196;

VOL. XLV.—NO. XC.

LIN

Religious Communities, the 'critical study of the Bible,' 198; treatment of the Old Testament, 198; the Book of Common Prayer, 201; question of the provision of additional services, 202; irregular Sunday services, 204; the place of the sermon, 205; the administration of Baptism, 207; the duty of the Church to the Colonies, 207 *sq.*; criticism of Cardinal Vaughan's treatment of the Conference's declaration on the unity of the Church, 209 *sqq.*; statement of the Anglican doctrine of unity, 211; declaration on Foreign Missions, 212; the Bishop of Lincoln's addresses to the Bishops on the work of the Church, 213 *sq.*

Lewis, Mr. H. K., *The Child: its Spiritual Nature*, 490

Lewis, Mrs., *Some Pages of the Four Gospels retranscribed from the Sinaitic Palimpsest, with a Translation of the whole Text*, 483

Libellus Precum ad usum Cleri Anglicani idoneus (Anon.), 225

Lincoln, the diocese of, 174 *sqq.*: notice of the completion of H. Bradshaw's *Statutes of Lincoln Cathedral* (ed. Chr. Wordsworth), 174; Bishop Alnwick's *Laudum*, and the *Novum Registrum*, 175; *Diocesan History of Lincoln* (by the late Precentor Venables and Archdeacon Perry), 176; the position of Lincoln in the mediæval Church, 177; various alterations in the extent of the diocese, 178; Bishop Remigius, 179; St. Hugh of Avalon, 180; Robert Grosseteste, 181; Wiclif and his followers, 182; Origin of the foundation of Lincoln College, Oxford, 183; other Lincolnshire benefactors to Oxford University, *ib.*; miserable squabbles among the Lincoln Cathedral dignitaries, 184; treatment of the diocese at the Reformation, 185; its later bishops: Bullingham, Winniffe, Sanderson, Honywood, 186 *sq.*;

N N

LOG

- connexion of the diocese with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 187; state of the diocese under Bishop Wake, 188; the Evangelical Revival, *ib.*; Bishops Pretyman (Tomline) and Kaye, 189
- Λόγια Ἰησοῦ: *Sayings of our Lord* (ed. &c. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt), 215
- Lunn, Mr. J. R., *Bishop Barlowe's Dialogue on the Lutheran Factions*, 235
- Luther's Primary Works, together with his Shorter and Larger Catechisms* (English translation, ed. Dr. Wace and Dr. Buchheim), 498

MACLEANE, Mr. Douglas, *A History of Pembroke College, Oxford*, [with] *short Historical Notices of the more eminent Members of the House*, 254

Magistretti, Dr., *Pontificale ad usum Ecclesiæ Mediolanensis, necnon ordines Ambrosiani*, 520

Marriage Question, The: a Manual of Notes for Parson and People (Anon.), 243

McChesney, L. S., *Under Shadow of the Mission: a Memory of Santa Barbara*, 503

McGiffert, Professor, *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, 513

Missions, Early Christian, in relation to Heathen Religions, 53 *sqq.*: need of the study of this subject, 53; two principles brought sharply into contrast in missionary work, 54; the relation in which the ancient world stood to God: the patriarchs, 56; St. Paul's addresses to heathen audiences, 57; the methods of early Christian missionaries, 59; extracts from the Apostolical Fathers: St. Clement, Hermas, 60; St. Justin Martyr, 61; his statement of analogies between the Christian Revelation and Gentile wisdom, 63; St. Irenæus, Theophilus of Antioch: the pas-

MOR

sage from polytheism to the conception of Divine Unity, 65; St. Cyprian, Tertullian: the reality of the knowledge existing among the Gentiles, 66; Minucius Felix, Athenagoras: the knowledge of the Divine Unity to be found among the heathen, 68; Arnobius, Lactantius: there are traces among the heathen of an earlier belief in the Divine Unity, 70; some of the philosophers rightly discerned the nature of the chief good, 73; views of writers of the Alexandrian school: Clement of Alexandria: desire to reconcile the old with the new, 75; Origen: heathen Platonists knew the Father and the Son by nature, 77; St. Augustine's teaching, 78; the truths of natural religion insisted upon by mediæval theologians, *ib.*; the effect of the Incarnation retrospective no less than prospective, 79; the peril of modern heathenism, 79 *sq.*

Modern Reader's Bible, The (ed. Prof. Moulton), 253

Monastery, an English, the internal order of, 427 *sqq.*; Mr. J. W. Clark's edition of the *Observances* of Barnwell Priory, and Mr. Taunton's work on the English Benedictines, 430; differences between the rules of the Benedictines and those of the Augustinians, 431; sketch of the life of the Benedictines: the spiritual family, 433; account of the Barnwell Augustinians: the canons and *ministri*, 436; boys' schools, 437; novices, 438; government of the house, 439; Obedientiaries: their various functions, 440; the library, 443; Cellarer and Chamberlain, 445; the Hosteller, the Fraterer, and the Kitchener, 446; the church offices and the meals, 447; moral or religious life, 449

Morfill, Mr. W. R., *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch, translated from the Slavonic*, 220

Mortimer, Rev. Dr., *Catholic Faith and Practice: a Manual for*

C
m
Mou
St
L
th

N
O
T
Old

(B
M
of
tha
Ba
ren
of
Mr
res
268
nat
tre
'or
ele
272
rev
cov
pro
275
the
Ne
Mr
his
Oxf
of t

PAL
from
Poe
(Sec
Parker
Lig
Phillip
Star
mon
Life
Pusey,
of th
Lidd
carry

MOU

- Conformation and First Communion*, 239
 Moule, Rev. Dr., *Philippian Studies: Lessons in Faith and Love from St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, 494

NASH, Professor, *Genesis of the Social Conscience*, 511

OFFICIAL *Year-Book of the Church of England*, 1897, *The*, 263

Old Testament, Aspects of the (Bampton Lectures for 1897, by Mr. Otley), 265 *sqq.*: the spirit of these lectures compared with that of the conditions of the Bampton Trust, 266; the surrender of the traditional view of of the Old Testament, 267; what Mr. Otley accepts as 'assured results' of the 'Higher Criticism', 268; his statements on the Incarnation, and on inspiration, 270; treatment of the story of the 'origins,' 271; of 'the historical element in the Old Testament,' 272; 'the history of a progressive revelation,' 273; the ancient covenant and its worship, 274; prophecy and the Messianic hope, 275; on the Hagiographa, 276; the use of the Old Testament by New Testament writers, 277; Mr. Otley's special summary of his subject, 279

Oxford House Papers (by Members of the University), 252

PALGRAVE, Mr. F. T., *The Golden Treasury: selected from the best Songs and Lyrical Poems in the English Language* (Second Series), 527

Parker, Rev. J., *The Saviour in the Light of the First Century*, 238

Phillips Brooks, Bishop, *New Starts in Life, and other Sermons*, 250; *The More Abundant Life: Lenten Readings*, *ib.*

Pusey, Dr. (notice of the conclusion of the *Life* by the late Canon Liddon), 279 *sqq.*: the complete carrying out of the original object

ST.

of the work, 280; some misconceptions cleared up: Dr. Pusey and Professor Jowett, *ib.*; the theory of Evolution, 281; Dr. Pusey's position towards scientific studies, 282; towards Ritual, 283; attitude on the subject of the criticism of the Old Testament, 285; his efforts after Reunion: the *Eirenicon*, 287; defence of the use of the Athanasian Creed, 288; the *Declaration on Confession and Absolution*, 289; his views on Everlasting Punishment, 290; correspondence with Dr. Farrar, 291; the pastoral spirit of Dr. Pusey, 292; his views on the abolition of University tests, 293; the foundation of Keble College, 294; Dr. Pusey's death, 295; estimate of his character and work, 295 *sq.*

QUERDEC, YVES LE, *Lettres d'un Curé de Campagne* and *Lettres d'un Curé de Canton*, 531

RITCHIE, Rev. A., *Adrift among the Dead, and other Sermons*, 502

SACRED Manhood of the Son of God, the, 163 *sqq.* (Dr. Gifford's work, *The Incarnation*): increased attention bestowed by theologians on the human aspects of the Incarnate Life of our Lord, 163; need of caution lest the truth of His true Godhead be obscured, 164; errors of recent treatment of the 'kenosis,' 166; Dr. Gifford's investigation of Philippians ii. 5-11, 167; his exegesis of the word *ὑπαχχω*, 168; Canon Gore's opposition thereto, 169; confirmation of Dr. Gifford's view, 170; his interpretation of *τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς Θεοῦ*, 171.—Notice of Mr. Hawkesworth's *De Incarnatione Verbi Dei*, 172

St. Luke, Dr. Plummer's Commentary on, 409 *sqq.*: defects and excellences of the work, 410; discussion of New Testament

ST.

- Greek, 411; Dr. Plummer's treatment of 'fads,' 414; his literary common sense, 415; proofs of his careful study, 416; use of illustrations from Latin versions, 418; *errata* noticed, 419 *n.*; wrong references and misleading statements, 421; the history of St. Luke, 422; his style and relation to St. Matthew and St. Mark, 423; date, object, and plan of his Gospel, 424; connexion between the third and fourth Gospels, 425; the subject matter of St. Luke's Gospel, 426
- St. Sulpice, The Method of, for the Organizing of Catechisms, with Plans of Instruction for the various Catechisms*, 489
- Sandford, Bishop (Gibraltar), *A Pastoral Letter*, 519
- Scott, Rev. Dr., *Origin and Development of the Nicene Theology, with some Reference to the Ritschlian View of Theology and History of Doctrine*, 492
- Shorter, Mr. C. K., *Charlotte Brontë and her Circle*, 248
- Spottiswoode, Mr. G. A., *The Holy Orders of the Church of England: addressed to Laymen*, 532
- Swete, Rev. Dr., *Church Services and Service Books before the Reformation*, 487
- T**ENNYSON, Alfred, Lord (notice of the Memoir by his son), 331 *sqq.*: Tennyson's birth and distinguished coevals, 331; early home-life, 332; at Cambridge: *Timbuctoo*, 333; *Poems chiefly Lyrical*, followed by a period of gloom, 333 *sq.*; Arthur Hallam and *In Memoriam*, 334;

WOO

- period of his best work, 335; further trials, 336; Carlyle's friendship, 337; Tennyson's marriage, *ib.*; life and work in the Isle of Wight, 338; appreciation of Tennyson: his scientific knowledge, 340; love of Astronomy, 341; an enemy of unbelief and agnosticism, 342; views on Evolution, 343 *sq.*: treatment of religious subjects, 345; of creeds and forms of faith, 346; of immortality, 347; of the Bible, 348; of Christ and the Incarnation, 349; of prayer, 350; his reverence for holy things, 351; of spiritual communion, 352; summary of the value of his work, 352 *sqq.*; Jowett's appreciation of it, 354; Tennyson's personal characteristics, *ib.*; love of his country, 355; the heritage he has left us, 356
- Thom, Mr J. H., *A Spiritual Faith* (Sermons), 257
- Tomlinson, Mr. J. T., *The Prayer Book, Articles, and Homilies: some forgotten Facts in their History which may decide their interpretation*, 489
- W**ALPOLE, Rev. Dr., *The Great Example*, 495
- Walsh, Mr. Walter, *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, 516
- Webb, Bishop (Grahamstown), *The Unveiling of the Eternal Word*, 502
- Westcott, Bishop, *Some Lessons on the Revised Version of the New Testament*, 223
- Woodhouse, Rev. F. C., *Monasticism Ancient and Modern*, 504

PRINTED BY

SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

2

k, 335 ;
Carlyle's
n's mar-
t in the
eciation
cientific
f Astro-
unbelief
views on
ment of
f creeds
t of im-
Bible,
incarna-
50 ; his
gs, 351 ;
n, 352 ;
of his
appre-
nyson's
b. ; love
heritage

al Faith

Prayer
omilies ;
n their
de their

he Great

Secret
ovement,

wn), The
l Word,

ssons on
the New

onasti-
n, 504